The Library
of the
University of North Carolina

Collection of North Caroliniana

C378
UJ3
v. 20

This book must not be taken from the Library building

16 Jun 45 A

Jun 24

MAY 29 1960

LUNC-15M F 40

OCT 3 1 1940

L. U. N
Period.D

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
EXTENSION BULLETIN

Vol. XX JULY, 1940 NO. 1

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Compiled by
E. R. Rankin

Debate Handbook

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS
CHAPEL HILL MCMXL

EXTENSION BULLETINS

Vol. IV, No. 12. *Children of Old Carolina.* Historical Pageant for Children. Ethel T. Rockwell. Price 25c.

Vol. VII, No. 9. *Special Legal Relations of Married Women in N. C. as to Property, Contracts, and Guardianship.* Mary P. Smith. Price 25c.

Vol. VIII, No. 5. *The World Court. Debate Handbook.* Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. VIII, No. 8. *Studies in Taxation.* North Carolina Club Yearbook. 1927-1928. Price 50c.

Vol. IX, No. 4. *The Classification of Property for Taxation.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. IX, No. 8. *Plays for Schools and Little Theatres.* Frederick H. Koch and Nettina Strobach. Price 25c.

Vol. X, No. 5. *Independence for the Philippines.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XI, No. 3. *Compulsory Unemployment Insurance.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XII, No. 5. *The Sales Tax.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XIII, No. 3. *Radio Control and Operation.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XIV, No. 2. *Federal Aid to Education.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XV, No. 1. *Play Producing for Schools and Little Theatres.* Frederick H. Koch and staff members of the Carolina Playmakers. Price 50c.

Vol. XV, No. 2. *Socialization of Medicine.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XVI, No. 2. *Government Ownership and Operation of Electric Utilities.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XVI, No. 4. *Plays for Schools and Little Theatres (Revised).* Price 50c.

Vol. XVII, No. 3. *Unicameral Legislatures.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XVII, No. 4. *First Principles of Play Direction.* Samuel Selden. Price 50c.

Vol. XVIII, No. 2. *Anglo-American Alliance.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XIX, No. 1. *Audio-Visual Aids to Schools, Colleges, Churches, and Adult Study Groups.* Free.

Vol. XIX, No. 2. *Government Ownership and Operation of the Railroads.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price, 50 cents.

Vol. XIX, No. 3. *Academic Contests for North Carolina High Schools.* Announcement for the year 1939-40. Free.

Vol. XIX, No. 4. *Fourth Annual North Carolina School Art Exhibition.* Announcement for the year 1940-41. Free.

Vol. XX, No. 1. *Universal Military Training.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price, 50 cents.

MONEY ORDERS, CHECKS, OR STAMPS ACCEPTED

ADDRESS: UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION, CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
EXTENSION BULLETIN

Vol. XX JULY, 1940 NO. 1

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Compiled by
E. R. Rankin

Debate Handbook

Published six times a year, July, September, October, November, January, and March, by the University of North Carolina Press. Entered as second-class matter October 19, 1921, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

http://www.archive.org/details/universityofnort201940

Library Univ of
North Carolina

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

THE HIGH SCHOOL DEBATING UNION 5

Historical Sketch 5

Regulations 9

QUERY: RESOLVED, That the United States should adopt a policy of requiring one year of military training of all able-bodied men before they reach the age of 23 12

Explanations and Limitations 12

GENERAL REFERENCES 13

Louis Johnson, The Atlantic Monthly 13

Fletcher Pratt, The New Republic 21

Robert Strausz-Hupe, Current History 25

Article, The New York Times 27

Editorial, The Raleigh News and Observer 29

H. W. Chase, The New York Times 30

Editorial, The Greensboro Daily News 31

Editorial, The Gastonia Daily Gazette 32

Editorial, The Greensboro Daily News 33

Editorial, The Greensboro Daily News 33

Article, The New York Times 34

AFFIRMATIVE REFERENCES 35

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., The American Magazine 35

Hugh A. Drum, The New York Times 39

James W. Wadsworth, The Congressional Record 44

J. Edgar Hoover, Woman's Day 49

247537

Page

R. P. Patterson 52

Freda Kirchwey, The Nation 54

Amos A. Fries 56

Editorial, Business Week 57

Editorial, The New York Times 59

Editorial, The New York Times 60

Eugene Lyons, The American Mercury 61

Editorial, The New York Times 62

Editorial, The New York Times 63

Editorial, The Gastonia Daily Gazette 64

Newsweek, The Periscope 64

NEGATIVE REFERENCES 65

Oswald Garrison Villard, Forum and Century 65

George W. Norris 73

Hanson W. Baldwin, Harper's Magazine 78

Editorial, The New Republic 83

Article, The Kansas City Star 85

Editorial, Christian Century 87

Committee on Militarism in Education 89

Norman Thomas 91

Charles A. Ellwood, Durham Morning Herald 93

BIBLIOGRAPHY 96

THE HIGH SCHOOL DEBATING UNION

HISTORICAL SKETCH

The High School Debating Union was organized among the high schools of North Carolina by the Dialectic and Philanthropic literary societies of the University of North Carolina during the school year 1912-13. The query of that year was, RESOLVED, *That the constitution of North Carolina should be so amended as to allow women to vote under the same qualifications as men.* Ninety schools participated in the first annual state-wide debate, which was held on February 22, 1913. Sixteen schools won both debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill for the final contest. The Pleasant Garden high school, represented by Grady Bowman and S. C. Hodgin, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on March 7, 1913.

One hundred and fifty schools took part in the second annual state-wide debate on March 20, 1914, on the subject, RESOLVED, *That the constitution of North Carolina should be so amended as to allow the initiative and referendum in state-wide legislation.* Forty-one schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill for the final contest. The Winston-Salem high school, represented by Charles Roddick and Clifton Eaton, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 3, 1914. During the school year 1913-14 the High School Debating Union was incorporated as a regular feature of the work of the University Extension Division.

Two hundred and fifty schools took part in the third annual state-wide contest on March 26, 1915, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt the policy of subsidizing its merchant marine engaged in foreign trade.* Fifty schools won both debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill for the final contest. The Wilson high school, represented by Misses Lalla Rookh Fleming and Ethel Gardner, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 9, 1915.

The query which was discussed in the fourth annual state-wide contest, which was held on March 31, 1916, was, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt the policy of greatly enlarging its navy.* Three hundred and twenty-five schools enrolled for the contest. Sixty-eight schools won both of their debates and sent their speakers to Chapel Hill for the final contest. Miss Myrtle Cooper and Boyd Harden, speakers on the affirmative for the Graham high school, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 14, 1916.

Three hundred and thirty-one schools participated in the fifth annual state-wide debate, which was held on March 31, 1917, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the federal government should own and operate the railways.* Seventy-four schools won both of their debates and sent their debaters to Chapel Hill for the final contest. The Waynesville high school, represented by Vinson Smathers and Roy Francis, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 20, 1917.

The sixth annual contest centered around the query, RESOLVED, *That Congress should enact a law providing for the compulsory arbitration of*

industrial disputes. Three hundred schools participated in the triangular debates on March 29, 1918. Sixty-six schools won both debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill to enter the final contest. Thomas Burton and Will Anderson, representing the Wilson high school, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 12, 1918.

One hundred and eighty schools enrolled for the seventh annual state-wide debate on April 4, 1919, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States government should adopt a policy requiring one year of military training for all able-bodied men before they reach the age of 21.* Forty-one schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University for the final contest. The Durham high school, represented by Miss Aura Holton and Leo Brady, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on May 2, 1919.

Two hundred schools participated on April 14, 1920, in the eighth annual state-wide debate on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt a policy of further material restriction of immigration.* Forty-four schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University to take part in the final contest. The Asheville high school, represented by Arthur Kale and Clifton Ervin, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 28, 1920.

Two hundred schools participated in the ninth annual state-wide debating contest on April 1, 1921. The query was, RESOLVED, *That the policy of collective bargaining through trade unions should prevail in American industry.* Fifty schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University for the final contest. Miss Eunice Hutchins and Ludlow Rogers, of the Durham high school, representing the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 15, 1921.

Two hundred and fifty schools took part in the tenth annual state-wide debate on March 24, 1922, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should enter the League of Nations.* Sixty schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill for the final contest. The Durham high school, represented by Linwood Hollowell and Freeman Twaddell, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 7, 1922.

Two hundred and fifty schools participated in the eleventh annual state-wide debate on March 31, 1923, on the query, RESOLVED, *That Congress should provide for the enforcement of decisions of the Railroad Labor Board.* Sixty schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University for the final contest. The Elizabeth City high school, represented by Misses Ellen Mellick and Mary Dozier, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 13, 1923.

Two hundred and fifty schools took part in the twelfth annual state-wide debate on March 28, 1924, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the inter-allied war debts should be cancelled.* Seventy-one schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University for the final contest. The Wilson high school, represented by Miss Catherine Ware and Fred Carr, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 11, 1924.

Two hundred and thirty-five schools entered the thirteenth annual state-

wide contest on March 27, 1925. The query was, RESOLVED, *That North Carolina should ratify the port terminals and water transportation act.* Sixty-five schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill for the final contest. Miss Catherine Ware and Fred Carr, of the Wilson high school, representing the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 10, 1925.

Two hundred and twenty-four schools took part in the fourteenth annual state-wide debate on April 2, 1926, on the query, RESOLVED, *That North Carolina should levy a state tax on property to aid in the support of an eight months school term.* Sixty-seven schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University for the final contest. The Winston-Salem high school, represented by Misses Mell Efird and Loretto Carroll, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 16, 1926.

Two hundred and twenty-three schools participated in the fifteenth annual state-wide debate on April 1, 1927, on the query, RESOLVED, *That Congress should enact the Curtis-Reed bill, providing for a federal department of education.* Sixty-seven schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. Harry Gump and Henry Biggs, of the Greensboro high school, representing the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 20, 1927.

One hundred and ninety-five schools entered the sixteenth annual state-wide debate which was held on April 6, 1928. The query for that year was, RESOLVED, *That Congress should enact the McNary-Haugen farm relief bill.* Fifty schools won both of their debates and sent their representatives to the University. The Washington Collegiate Institute, represented by Henry Roper and Hal Hopper, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 20, 1928.

One hundred and ninety-six schools participated in the seventeenth annual state-wide contest on April 5, 1929, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should join the World Court.* Fifty-nine schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill. Floyd Adams and Shearod Crumpler, of the Roanoke Rapids high school, representing the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 19, 1929.

One hundred and eighty-six schools took part in the eighteenth annual state-wide contest on April 4, 1930, on the query, RESOLVED, *That North Carolina should adopt the proposed constitutional amendment, authorizing the classification of property for taxation.* Fifty-one schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. The Goldsboro high school, represented by Miss Eleanor Bizzell and Ezra Griffin, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 18, 1930.

Two hundred and eighteen schools entered on April 3, 1931, the nineteenth annual state-wide contest on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should grant immediate independence to the Philippines.* Fifty-two schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. Miss Marian Weil and Ezra Griffin, of the Goldsboro high school, representing the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 17, 1931.

Two hundred and fourteen schools took part in the twentieth annual state-wide contest on April 1, 1932, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt a system of compulsory unemployment insurance.* Fifty-five schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill. The Curry high school, represented by Miss Katherine Keister and Nash Herndon, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 15, 1932.

Two hundred and fifteen schools entered the twenty-first annual state-wide debate on March 31, 1933, on the query, RESOLVED, *That North Carolina should adopt the sales tax as a feature of its state system of revenue.* Fifty-one schools won both of their debates and sent their representatives to Chapel Hill. The Broughton high school, of Raleigh, represented by Miss Katherine Martin and Wade Marr, Jr., on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 14, 1933.

Two hundred schools participated in the twenty-second annual state-wide high school debate on March 30, 1934, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt the essential features of the British system of radio control and operation.* Forty-five schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. The Thomasville high school, represented by Miss Katherine Covington and A. C. Lovelace, Jr., on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 13, 1934.

Two hundred and twenty-five schools took part in the twenty-third annual state-wide high school debate on March 22, 1935, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt the policy of extending federal aid to general public education.* Sixty-eight schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill. The Goldsboro high school, represented by Powell Bland and Maurice Edwards, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 12, 1935.

Two hundred and twenty-seven schools participated in the twenty-fourth annual state-wide high school debate on March 27, 1936, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the several states should provide for the socialization of medicine.* Sixty-four schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill. The Kinston high school, represented by Miss Rose Pully and Miss Minetta Bartlett, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 17, 1936.

Two hundred and thirty-three schools participated in the twenty-fifth annual state-wide high school debate on April 2, 1937, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the government should own and operate all electric light and power utilities.* Sixty-three schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. The Weldon high school, represented by Miss Frances Johnson and Philip Moore, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 22, 1937.

Two hundred and thirty-four schools participated in the twenty-sixth annual state-wide high school debate on April 1, 1938, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the several states should adopt a unicameral system of legislation.* Sixty-six high schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. The Union Grove high school, represented by Miss Fern

Templeton and Miss Wanona Rash, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 22, 1938.

Two hundred and thirty-seven schools took part in the twenty-seventh annual state-wide high school debate on March 31, 1939, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should establish an alliance with Great Britain.* Sixty-one schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. The High Point high school, represented by Kermit Albertson and George Humphreys, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 21, 1939.

Two hundred and twenty-five schools took part in the twenty-eighth annual state-wide high school debate on March 29, 1940, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should own and operate the railroads.* Fifty-five schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. The Monroe high school, represented by Moke Williams and Miss Elinor Ellwanger, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 19, 1940.

THE QUERY FOR 1940-41

The query which will be discussed this year by the high schools holding membership in the High School Debating Union of North Carolina is, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt a policy of requiring one year of military training of all able-bodied men before they reach the age of 23.* Attention is directed to the statement of the query, with the accompanying explanations and limitations, on page 12 of this handbook.

The thanks of the compilers of this debate handbook are extended to the publishers and authors who very kindly gave permission for the reprinting of articles included in the handbook.

REGULATIONS

1. The University Extension Division of the University of North Carolina will suggest a query, to be discussed on a given date by the schools entering the High School Debating Union.

2. All secondary schools of North Carolina, however supported, offering regularly organized courses of study above the seventh grade, and not extending in their scope and content beyond a standard high school or secondary school course, shall be eligible for membership in the High School Debating Union.

3. The schools accepting this offer and thus becoming members of the Union shall be arranged into groups of three for triangular debates, the status and standards of the schools, their proximity, accessibility, and convenience of location to be considered in forming the groups.

4. Each school of every triangular group shall agree to furnish two debating teams of two members each, the one to uphold the affirmative side of the query, and the other to defend the negative side.

5. The members of the debating teams must all be bona fide students of the schools they represent. To be bona fide students, they must be in regular attendance at the time of the debate, and they must have been in regular attendance for at least 30 per cent of the school year up to and

including the date of the debate, and they must have made passing grades on a majority of the studies in some regularly organized course of study.

6. No post graduate of a school—that is, no student who has already finished a four-year high school course—shall be eligible to represent his school in the contest. This shall not serve, however, to debar those students who are in upper classes in school systems modeled after the junior-senior plan (offering a five-year high school course) unless those students have already been graduated from, or awarded diplomas by, the schools which they are now attending or other high schools. If such students, or any students, have been graduated already, or awarded diplomas, they are, of course, ineligible to compete.

7. No student who became 21 years of age on or before September 1, 1940, shall be eligible to represent his school in the high school debates of the High School Debating Union.

8. The usual plan of procedure for the triangular contests will be for the affirmative teams to debate at home and for the negative teams to visit. However, whenever a plan for holding the debates on neutral ground is favored by at least two member schools of a given triangle, then the debates of that triangle will be held on neutral territory.

9. The schools themselves shall select and agree upon the judges of the local contests.

10. In the triangular debates, each speaker shall have twenty minutes at his disposal, not more than fifteen of which shall be used in the first speech.

11. In the debates of the High School Debating Union, the order of the speakers in the first speech shall be: affirmative, negative, affirmative, negative. The order of the speakers on rejoinder shall be: affirmative, negative, affirmative, negative. It is understood, however, that there is no objection to a reversal of this order of speakers on rejoinder in any given local debate, provided that such a reversal of order shall have been definitely agreed to beforehand by responsible authorities of both schools which are concerned in the given local debate.

12. The schools which shall win both of their debates shall be entitled to send their teams to the University to compete in the final contest for the Aycock Memorial Cup. It is understood, however, that the committee may arrange for an additional contest among the winning schools throughout the state prior to the final contest at the University, should this plan appear to be necessary under the circumstances.

13. In the event that one school of a triangle drops out and the committee at Chapel Hill is unable to secure a school to take its place, then the two schools remaining shall hold a dual debate with one another, with each school sending its team on the negative to the other.

14. In the event that two schools of a triangle drop out of the Union and the committee is unable to secure schools to take their places, then the remaining school shall be declared the winner over the others by their default.

15. The school having the strongest team on the affirmative side of the

query and the school having the strongest team on the negative side shall be entitled to contest publicly at the University for the Aycock Memorial Cup. (The strongest team in each side of the query is to be determined by means of preliminary contests in debate at Chapel Hill. After a contestant has been eliminated in a preliminary at Chapel Hill in this year's final contest, the contestant will not be permitted to change sides and participate further in this year's final contest.)

16. The school which shall win the debate, thus finally held, shall have its name inscribed on the Aycock Memorial Cup.

17. Any school which shall win the final contest for two years in succession shall have the cup for its own property.

18. All contestants are expected to prepare their own speeches with legitimate assistance of the teachers, principals, or superintendents in their school systems. Legitimate assistance is interpreted to mean oral advice, suggestions, discussions, and criticism.

SUGGESTIONS AS TO JUDGES

1. The judges should be disinterested parties to the success of either team and, so far as possible, should be non-local.

2. They should sit apart during the debate.

3. They should judge the contest as a debate, and at its conclusion should vote "Affirmative" or "Negative" on the merits of the debate. They should not consider the merits of the question.

4. Each judge should sign and seal his vote and deliver it, through an usher, to the presiding officer who should publicly open the votes and announce the decision.

Before the debates begin, a copy of these suggestions should be given to each judge for his guidance.

ORIGINALITY OF DEBATES

The committee realizes that "The debate which a speaker produces should be his very best; but it should under no circumstances be better than his best; that the success of the Union will be seriously hindered unless in each instance the speech of a debater represents his own individual work." It wishes, therefore, to ask the principals to give this matter their very careful consideration and to note particularly regulation 18. In cases where necessary, the principals in the various triangles should take such action among themselves as they deem necessary. Great care should be taken by all means to see to it that wherever a speaker uses any quoted material, proper credit is given in his speech to the source from which the quotation was derived.

For further information, address

E. R. RANKIN,
Secretary, High School Debating Union, Chapel Hill, N. C.

QUERY

RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt a policy of requiring one year of military training of all able-bodied men before they reach the age of 23.*

EXPLANATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

For the purpose of clarity of issue in the contest of the High School Debating Union of North Carolina, the following explanations and limitations of the meaning of the query are distinctly set down:

1. It is understood that the statement of the query contemplates the requirement that all able-bodied male citizens of continental United States should serve one year in the armed forces of the nation—land, sea, or air—before they reach the age of 23. In this connection, it is of course known that the armed forces perform a vast variety of duties supplementary to, and in addition to, actual combat training.

2. It is understood that this query revolves around the question of a long-range national defense policy—the question of the advisability of a fixed policy of requiring one full year's active military training and service for all able-bodied men before they become 23. Universal military training, as considered for this debate, is not thought of just for an emergency situation or development—but it is thought of in terms of a definite policy for a long period of time.

3. It is understood that the statement of the query contemplates that the government—through departments and agencies—would make such rules and regulations for putting this general policy into effect as might seem wise and proper. Details would naturally be worked out by the government.

4. In the case of aliens, the government might—if it chose—assign aliens to work on national defense projects for one year instead of inducting them into the armed forces proper.

5. It is understood that those receiving twelve months' military training in this way would remain in the reserves for a period of at least eight years—subject to such call as the state of the nation might render necessary.

6. It is understood that the government might—if it chose—allow credit, to some extent, for military training in educational institutions; but in no case would a credit total of more than six months be permitted an individual for training done in schools and colleges. If a maximum credit of six months were earned in this way, it would still be necessary for an individual to spend six full months in the armed forces proper.

7. It is estimated that the proposed plan would bring into the armed forces of the nation around 900,000 young men annually, for their year of military training and service.

8. It is understood that any question as to the constitutionality of the proposed policy is hereby waived from the discussions in the debates of the High School Debating Union.

GENERAL REFERENCES

HEMISPHERE DEFENSE

(An article by Louis Johnson in the Atlantic Monthly, volume 166, pages 1-7, July, 1940.)

On April 9, 1940, Germany occupied Denmark. On that day, the present war jumped the Atlantic ocean. Greenland is America. Denmark, its erstwhile owner, has lost her sovereignty. Who will rule over Greenland is the business of America.

On May 10, 1940, the German blitzkreig flashed into the Netherlands. On that day the war was brought within seven hundred miles of the Panama canal. The Dutch West Indies are in the western hemisphere. The swastika now flies over Holland. Who may try to take over the possessions is the concern of the free American republics.

In the hands of an un-American power, these parcels of new world territory may prove dangerous to the security of the entire twenty-one American republics. To talk of oceans as formidable barriers against a war three thousand miles away is therefore empty prattle. The guns may not yet be shooting, but reverberations from the shock of battle in western Europe we feel now in the Americas.

The security of this hemisphere depends on the maintenance of two fundamental conditions: first, a Panama canal open for the transit of the United States fleet; second, an America that denies aggressors operation of bases anywhere in the western world. So long as these requirements are met, the Americas will be safe from a foreign aggressor.

Traditionally, the navy has always been our first line of defense. It remains so today. But it is a one-ocean navy, with danger lurking in both the Atlantic and Pacific. To divide our fleet would court disaster. It is a sound naval doctrine that a second-best navy is as valueless as a second-best poker hand. We must be able to move it promptly, in its entirety, wherever it may be needed. The importance of the Panama canal for this purpose becomes obvious.

Within American waters, the United States navy probably could oppose successfully any single fleet which can now be brought against it. We cannot feel assured, however, that it could deny access to this hemisphere under all conditions. The recent trend of world affairs has disclosed possible naval combinations of greatly superior strength not to be lightly discounted. Years are required to effect material increases in naval forces. We can scarcely afford to stake our existence as a free people on a single barrier.

The Atlantic ocean has never been an insurmountable obstacle. It has been jumped before. In the War of 1812, the British landed troops along Chesapeake bay because our navy was too small, and marched on to Washington. During the War between the States, the French dropped anchor in Mexican waters and set up a puppet state in that country because we were too busy fighting elsewhere. What has been done before may be done again.

II

As was recently demonstrated in Europe, even vastly superior naval power is not a certain denial of invasion. Warfare has definitely entered the third dimension. To be sure, direct violation of continental America by air is impractical today, whatever it may become tomorrow. The danger lies in the establishment of enemy intermediate bases in such localities as Greenland, Bermuda, the West Indies, and the northern coast of South America to the east; or in Alaska, Hawaii, and similar areas to the west. The complete denial of such bases to an aggressor is beyond the unsupported capacity of the navy. Recourse must then be had to our army.

In furtherance of the common objective, the first duty delegated to the army is the provision of garrisons in our overseas possessions for the protection of our naval installations. This project is nearing completion. The Hawaiian islands now constitute a real Gibraltar in the Pacific. Recent additions to our garrison in the Panama canal zone have rendered it reasonably secure except from land-based air attacks, and we are taking steps that will soon protect us against that contingency. Material increases in our military forces in Puerto Rico have helped to convert the Caribbean sea into an American lake, thus adding to the defense of the all-important canal. An air outpost will soon be developed in Alaska. The objective has been nearly reached, but the accomplishment has absorbed nearly one-third of our active military strength.

The second task confronting the army is the protection of America against raids. In pursuance of this end, the army and navy, acting as a team, must deny an aggressor bases from which he can institute an attack on the canal or against any one of the American republics. The protective ring thus spread over the western hemisphere is by no means entirely altruistic. It is indicated by stern military necessity. The establishment of an enemy base anywhere in the Americas is a definite and serious threat against the United States. If we cannot wholly prevent such landings by sea or air, at the very minimum we must be fully prepared to eject the invader promptly.

For this purpose we must have a small, adequately trained, properly armed, highly mobile, seasoned force capable of acting instantly in the event of an emergency. With this requirement in mind, the war department, with additional funds authorized by the President last September, organized five triangular or streamlined divisions. These units are now equipped with modern material and have undergone a six months' period of intensive field training. As compared to the World War divisions, an actual increase in fire power has been coupled with a decrease of nearly two-thirds in personnel. Mobility has been greatly accentuated. The triangular division includes no animals of any kind. All loads are carried or drawn by automotive equipment. Increased appropriations for the new fiscal year will enable the army to create four more of these modern military teams, or a total of nine compact fighting units. Note, however, that this force will not greatly exceed that employed for the subjugation of Norway.

Another valuable asset is our mechanized cavalry brigade. Its basic

arm is the combat car, in effect a light, fast tank. These modern chariots are supplemented by scout cars, lightly armored vehicles, whose mission is to contact the enemy, determine his intentions, and thus pave the way for attack, and by highly mobile artillery to support the effort. Motorized infantry has recently been added to this mechanized brigade. Within a few months we expect to expand this unit into a division. It will be the fastest and hardest-hitting force in our army. However, it will not match even the mechanized force used by the British in Belgium.

To round out the national-defense team, we must have a highly effective air force. The ability to deny the American skies to all possible aggressors is beyond our immediate capacity. For the world of today, our air power is small indeed. The President's expansion program aims to correct this deficiency, but no matter how we try we must reconcile ourselves to some delay. Appropriations cannot be translated into planes and engines or pilots and mechanics in a month, or even in a year. Planes cannot be bought at the counter. Engines are not available in factories. Pilots cannot be recruited from chauffeurs. Airplane mechanics cannot be picked up in automobile garages. We cannot escape the time factor.

In addition to the air corps, we need anti-aircraft in quality and quantity to protect our land forces and installations from air attack. Although our strength in this field is today inadequate, within the next year we can be assured of greatly increased numbers of necessary weapons in this field.

The mass use of combat aviation in other parts of the world is no immediate threat to America. No aggressor can now operate against the Americas in great numbers. Before he could do so in the near future he would have to acquire bases on this hemisphere. To deny him such stepping-stones is the foundation of hemisphere defense; and to do so successfully we dare not depend on air force alone, particularly since it is not now obtainable, nor upon passive anti-aircraft defense, for the production of anti-aircraft artillery is another of our narrow bottlenecks; nor upon either of them alone, even if fully available. Successful defense is a team effort consisting of a compact, properly balanced force of all arms of all service, for land, air, and sea warfare.

III

Another problem confronting the war department is the provision of a basic force which can be expanded to meet the full needs of a grave emergency. As already indicated our primary M-day force is our regular army. It must be kept in a continual state of readiness. The supplementary M-day force is the national guard. Its units are now receiving modern equipment in quantity, but it will be many months before the project is completed. Next August, national guard organizations throughout the country will engage in intensive field exercises in conjunction with the regular army triangular divisions. The total number of men involved will exceed 300,000. Twenty-one days will be utilized for this purpose instead of the usual fourteen.

We should not forget, however, that this is the first time in our peace-

time history that such extensive field training has been undertaken. We should not expect seasoned, experienced soldiers from a three-week period in the field, but we should get more satisfactory results than we had in the past. What in the last five years have been known as military maneuvers were in fact little more than troop assemblies. The national guard has been termed "Minute Men." If rushed into campaign conditions without adequate equipment or additional training to crush a stalwart foe, they might not last very much longer. The Dutch commander-in-chief recently said of his citizen soldiers: "They held on bravely against an overwhelming foe, but they were not equal to modern weapons." We must assure ourselves without delay that these words will never apply to us.

The reserve officers corps constitutes a reservoir of about 100,000 commissioned personnel who have received a considerable amount of training. These patriotic individuals, who have so generously contributed of their time, will meet the increased need of officers to man our wartime expansion. In many cases their military knowledge is largely confined to theory. Comparatively few have had any extended active service with troops. Many of them will be given the opportunity to take part in the maneuvers this summer. A greatly increased number will soon be offered active service for a period of six months in connection with scheduled increases in the regular army. And yet the majority will entirely lack troop experience. Leadership and technique cannot be acquired solely from the careful perusal of books.

The most serious of our national-defense problems lies in the procurement of munitions. We must assure ourselves that the regular army and the national guard, our initial protective force, can take the field at a moment's notice, properly armed and equipped. We must meet their requirements in munitions so that they will not later be overpowered because of the lack of supplies and equipment. We must be prepared to meet the needs of wartime augmentation to our armed forces. In short, we must provide emergency equipment for 500,000 men, their maintenance in the field, and the prompt supply of an expanding wartime army of not less than 1,000,000 men. This project, in all its ramifications, is known as the protective mobilization plan.

To accomplish this end, we not only must provide the existing force with a complete supply of modern arms and equipment, but must accumulate without delay a war-reserve stock of items not immediately available from commercial sources on the outbreak of war. If a million men are to spring to arms overnight, the arms must be on hand for them to "spring to." Because munitions are quickly expended when guns begin to shoot, it is necessary that there be enough on hand to tide over the early months of battle. In simple terms, an adequate war-reserve stock for our country should include enough munitions to maintain a force of one million men for a period of at least six months.

This equipment we do not have. Given sufficient time, the appropriations recently made by Congress will eventually provide the more critical portions of this material. But military arms and equipment cannot be bought in the open market. We have enough money to buy anything that is

for sale, but munitions are not available in a warehouse. We have the capacity to build them, but we cannot do that in a hurry. Weeks, months, and in most cases a year or two may elapse before we can get all the military equipment we need.

IV

The service of supply has assumed a role in the warfare of today at least coequal with that of the combatant forces. Nations have learned that, in general, it takes twice as long to manufacture, assemble, distribute, and issue to the soldier his equipment as it does to make him a well-trained and proficient fighting man. It takes time to produce tanks, artillery, gas masks, and other munitions for which no counterpart can be found in ordinary civilian production.

The question naturally arises as to why our army is still threadbare in view of the military appropriations made during recent years. Under our budgeting system, funds are allocated by law for specific purposes. During the past ten years, a total of about one-quarter of a billion dollars has been allotted to the purchase of new equipment. Including replacements of wornout items and modernization of armament left over from the World War, the total amount applied to equipment has been only about $500,000,000. Nearly half this sum was not made available until July 1, 1939. Modern armies cannot be created with such limited funds.

The amount appropriated for all military purposes since 1930 totals slightly more than four and one-half billion dollars. Approximately one-half of this amount has been devoted to the pay of personnel. The American soldier receives a minimum of $21 a month. According to wage standards in this country, surely seventy cents a day is not excessive. Yet in comparison with other armies in the world this constitutes very high recompense. One European government pays its soldiers sixty-five cents a month. Food, clothing, training, shelter, maintenance, repair and similar items account for the remainder of military expenditures in our army.

In 1939 this nation expended approximately 10 per cent of its total income on national defense. Only two important nations in the world, New Zealand and South Africa, have spent proportionately smaller amounts. In 1922 we voluntarily abandoned armed security in naïve confidence that a cynical world would emulate our example. Since then, the premium on our national defense-policy was not paid. Now we must make up the deficits with compound-interest charges attached.

This program, of course, will cost money, and, based on our own standards, more than any previous military expansion. It must be remembered, however, that compared to other countries we have only begun to build up our sinews of men and supplies. What is an appropriation of approximately two billion dollars to our American economy, which is running above seventy billion dollars today? Contrast it, for instance, with what Germany is spending on her munitions. It is estimated that, before 1939, 80 per cent of her forty-billion-dollar economy went into the production of munitions. Since then she has added the munitions of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Holland,

Belgium, and their arsenals and their productive facilities, including such extensive works as the Skoda in Czechoslovakia.

Preparedness is the most important challenge to America today. We must achieve it at whatever cost necessary. Extensive as our program may be today, it might become but a drop in the bucket compared with what we may have to pay if we do not utilize our brains, our energy, and our resources toward getting ready now. Our bottleneck is not money but time—time to convert money into guns and ammunition; time to erect factories and build airplanes; time to train and develop skilled labor and efficient management in the art of munitions manufacture; time to do those things which we have so long neglected. If we do not meet this challenge, we may not only have to pay the defaulted premiums on our national insurance, but have to face the loss of the policy as well.

V

To equip our army, we need 70,000 different items. The vast majority of them are commercial in character and are easily obtainable in the open market. There are, however, about 3,700 of them that present special problems.

Of these thirty-seven hundred, twenty-five hundred are in ordinary commercial use, but the demands for them in quantity in time of war might become so great as to impose a severe burden on industry. To avoid this contingency, thousands of manufacturing plants have been surveyed and production schedules worked out that will take care of our full needs.

The last group of 1,200 articles presents a more critical problem. It includes items not in ordinary use. For many there are no commercial demands. These are the munitions that are critical in building for national defense, and of which we must accumulate an adequate reserve.

For the production of these items we cannot depend on our government arsenals alone, since they were intended to be little more than experimental laboratories. For years they have operated on a restricted basis with antiquated facilities and reduced personnel. Their activities have consisted principally of the maintenance and repair of left-overs from the World War. Their equipment is being rapidly replaced and their capacity enlarged. They will soon be producing at accelerated rates, but at best they can satisfy little more than 10 per cent of our war needs. For the bulk of our munitions we must therefore turn to private industry.

We have no Krupp, Schneider, no Vickers in America; no munitions industry comparable to those abroad engaged almost wholly, in time of peace, in the production of implements of war. We must, therefore, rely on the conversion of our civilian plants into munitions factories. It is obvious that an industry geared to an economy of peace cannot be converted to war production overnight.

Recently we have placed educational orders with a number of plants, enabling them to obtain manufacturing experience on a limited scale. What is even more important, a small number of machine tools have been secured and production studies made. When quantity production became necessary

last fall, dividends in both time and money savings accrued to the government. Unfortunately, educational orders could be extended to only six companies last year, hence the cumulative benefit is meagre today. This year, increased funds have resulted in 115 orders. Within the next few months we expect to fortify our munitions front in this manner with an ever greater number of firms.

Current educational orders are of great importance in assuring a revival of the munitions art in our industrial structure, but they do not furnish the arms and equipment needed today. For this purpose we must discover facilities capable of manufacturing the required items with as little modification of existing methods as is feasible. Each day saved goes on the credit side of the master ledger under the heading of time.

In the solution of our munitions problems, industry will be accorded every possible assistance by the government. Private business will not be expected to modify its equipment or expand its facilities without financial assistance. The demand is periodic and may be of short duration. Major capital investments cannot be made in projects of this nature without entailing the probability of serious losses. Therefore the government will make available funds to assist in the conversion or expansion of plants and the erection of such new installations as are found to be necessary.

We must move fast. How to get up speed is largely a matter for the industry itself to work out, but the government, too, is eager and ready to cooperate. Yes, it will take more machinery, more floor space, more skilled and semi-skilled workers, but it will also take greater freedom in the negotiation of contracts between the armed forces and industry and more flexibility in the expenditure of funds. In the latter essentials toward speed-up, the government itself must lead the way. The war department will do all in its power to simplify and accelerate procurement procedure.

The chief impetus to speed-up must come from the continuous use of the tools and machinery already available in our factories. There are limits to the endurance of human beings, but machines do not wear out readily. We must prepare to put on two shifts and even three shifts a day to the full twenty-four hour maximum, and seven days a week, three hundred and sixty-five days a year.

VI

The war department is exerting every effort to expedite production of these items so essential to national defense. In 1917-18, we managed to shift into high gear on the munitions front in about twelve months, but only with the aid of a previous three-year period of extensive allied armament purchases from our industries. During the past ten months comparatively few such purchases have been made in this country. A generation ago we had a large munitions industry; today we have practically none. Even with our best efforts, we cannot hope, under existing conditions, to match our former achievement. Our industrial plants can produce any article we require, but they cannot put "time" on the assembly line.

Hemisphere defense today must consider not only men, bases, and arma-

ment, but also a new technique of war which does not necessarily depend on the crossing of oceans by hostile ships, planes, or transports. Air bases are not the only foothold we must deny a would-be aggressor. There have been significant victories during the present war on land, on sea, and in the air by force of arms, but there also have been considerable contributions by the fifth column, the Trojan horse of modern combat.

The greatest danger to the Panama canal is not in military force from the land, the sea, or the air. It lies in sabotage from within. A vessel might be blown up in the gates. Time bombs might be dropped in the locks. Dams might be blown up or other installations damaged or destroyed. Steps have been taken to minimize or nullify efforts along this line, but the possibility of such action cannot be completely denied. As an additional precaution and to provide greater facilities in the canal, the construction of another set of locks has been authorized. However, under present plans, they will not be ready for use for five or six years. Again, the persistent factor of time!

In the stables of the twenty-one American republics there must be no stalls reserved for Trojan horses. On our American picket line there can be no room for these instruments of disruption and revolution. They do not advertise their presence. Their operations are insidious. Industrial dissatisfaction is fostered, essential machines fail, products contain hidden defects, fires or explosions occur, all presumably in the normal course of events. It is only by their undue frequency that we mark the work of the fifth column.

These hidden enemies do not confine their sabotage to the industrial front. Their disruptive efforts reach far beyond this limited objective. They extend to the spreading of confusion and discord throughout our entire national life. Their aim is to undermine our free institutions, insure disunity of effort, and prevent effective resistance to the eventual lightning attack. We must be on the alert for manifestations of this Trojan-horse technique, not only in the United States but throughout the western hemisphere.

The fate of civilization may rest on the defense of the western hemisphere. That responsibility has been entrusted to the American people. We must not fail.

WHAT CAN WE DEFEND?

(An article by Fletcher Pratt in the New Republic, volume 103, pages 12-14, July 1, 1940.)

The existing structure of American defense was built upon the political theory that we could count on the cooperation of the British Empire in any conflict with more than one opponent, and upon a military theory composed of three assumptions. These were: that we faced no unsurmountable difficulties with the raw materials of war; that any enemy must approach us across an ocean; and that even in the most unfavorable circumstances this approach would consume so much time that we could meet the enemy at the shore with an emergency army.

The rapidly growing possibility of a complete axis victory in Europe has demolished the first half of this comfortable doctrine, and the manner in which that triumph is being achieved has vitiated the rest. Even the boast of military-economic self-sufficiency is gone. It depended upon a neutral Netherlands kingdom and our free access to its colonial products. It is now clear that German victory means that Holland will neither be free nor neutral in any war in which we are engaged.

It also means that there will be no neutralities whatever—which is to say that not only international law but military strategy must be revised in accordance with new concepts broadcast from Berlin. For our own safety's sake we are required to defend all the small, weak "neutrals" through which we may be reached. We are driven to a form of preventive imperialism so foreign to our modes of thought and action that the working out of the details is bound to entail considerable anguish in the months immediately before us.

As a matter of fact, if we are granted months in which to work out the new policy it will be because the British Empire proves a tough nut to crack. A power as dynamic as Germany will hardly abandon a career of successful brigandage after a quick victory in Europe, while there are desirable territories open to exploitation by the same methods. And surely Hitler is the last man to have the graciousness to let us set up barriers against whatever he may desire in the new world.

For the old barriers have clearly collapsed; the old concepts must be revised. The offensive against us need no longer be naval. It can be aero-political; it can be politico-military, working through puppet states and alliances. It can even be military-economic, like the drive which has enslaved Sweden without a direct blow.

The emergency army on which we counted, and even the militia army which forms two-thirds of our paper establishments, have been demonstrated as worthless. The pace of totalitarian war will not permit either to be mobilized. Even were the time for mobilization to be had, the technical demands of mechanical war are so severe that militiamen cannot acquire the necessary skill in the time allotted to their training—twenty-one days a year at present. Every indicator points to the idea that wars of the future must be fought out with the human and mechanical means ready to go into action at the beginning.

A navy has the advantage of being ready by definition, and we have a good one left over from the days before Norway—quite good enough at present to stand up against any two others exclusive of the British. Nor is this proportion likely to alter in our disfavor during the period it would take to build up other means of defense. We have six battleships building; no combination of hungry powers has more.

Anything the navy and its attached air service can defend, we can keep and protect. How much ground does this take in?

By general definition it includes all those spots to which the only practicable approaches are by water, and which lie within 2,500 miles on an American fleet base. Twenty-five hundred miles is the operating range of our fleet—the distance to which it can go on its own legs, fight a battle and return. If it ventures beyond this limit it must either find a base at the end of the trip or drag fuel-carriers with it—an intolerable condition in the face of an enemy because of the vulnerability of these vessels.

In the specific case Hawaii falls easily within the magic circle of the American fleet's range, the more since it is itself a fleet base. So does Alaska, where a theoretical enemy approach by air would have to base on Kamchatka, unsupported by supply lines and itself within range of our fleet. From Dutch Harbor down to Callao the Pacific coast is so hemmed in by mountains on the eastern side, so easily within range of the fleet on the west, that it may be considered immune to fortune.

On the Atlantic side Greenland, like Alaska, offers a theoretical air approach, but there is little useful land there in a military sense; the place consists only of a sheltered anchorage, untenable by any power that could not hold the sea. A sporadic raid might be run through the route; an attack, hardly. All eastern Canada, including Newfoundland, falls into the general definition and is beyond the range of any foreign fleet that must deal with opposition. So is Bermuda, and so the eastern coast of the United States, down to the beginning of a twilight zone representing the limit operating radius of airplanes based on the northernmost of the "small neutrals"—Mexico, Cuba, the Bahamas. At present this twilight zone begins at about the Virginia-North Carolina border, darkening southward; technical progress in aviation may extend it.

Yet it is hopelessly unrealistic to assume that the navy alone can defend all these regions because it can defend any of them. A larger navy might; the present one may have to choose.

For one of the most arresting features of the technique of total war has been the ability of its practitioners to obtain diversion and dispersion of opposing forces by creating a crisis in one area as a prelude to an attack in another. As allied armies were attracted to the near east before the slash into Scandinavia, so we might be whipsawed between Atlantic and Pacific—even if we make the not altogether justified assumption that the Panama canal will be open, to permit the fleet to make its run between the two operating areas in the minimum time of three weeks.

More striking than the inclusions in this list are the omissions, the places

undefended against the new form of war by an unassisted fleet. Guam is the most striking of such omissions in the Pacific. It is 3,300 miles from Hawaii, totally unfortified and without dockage facilities. Even for the limited amount of defense afforded by air it requires a flying field not now in existence and the dredging of the harbor to clear out subsurface knobs that lie ready to tear the bottom from a seaplane attempting to land.

It is not too much to say that Guam is the key to whatever Pacific problems face us, or would face us in the event of an axis victory. Stoutly fortified, dredged and supplied with docks, it instantly checks any Japanese drive to the south until it has been eliminated. If dockage at Manila could be added to the fortification of Guam (the only dock there now will take nothing bigger than a cruiser) our navy could cover the Philippines and make secure against any possible attack the vital routes to the rubber, tin, tungsten, chromium and wool of the South Seas. The possibility of axis victory and the removal of the protecting mantle of the British navy, so long cast over these routes, turns congressional objections to the fortification of Guam because it might offend the dear, good, kind Japanese into the same sort of clotted nonsense that got men of Munich into trouble.

Without the fleet, Alaska also is something of a danger point; probably it should have something more than the two naval air bases and the single army air base now under construction there. But on the whole, the Pacific defensive problem is a relatively light one in comparison with those that face us in the Atlantic or Caribbean.

Above all the Caribbean. The north Atlantic area, for all the weakness of the "peace frontier" with Canada, presents no problems that would not be solved by the same means required in the south. In fact, the Caribbean region may be regarded as an extreme case of the north Atlantic.

It is starred with these "small neutrals" which are the bearing points for those new forms of attack made in Germany—the fifth column, the Trojan horse and the sudden intrusion of armed force. One of these nations —Mexico—already has powerful pro-fascist groups. On at least two others —Curaçao, Surinam—an axis victory would give the nazis a strong legal claim. It is entirely possible that such a victory might be followed by the cession, so far as legal documents could complete it, of others even more dangerous to us—British Honduras, Jamaica, Martinique, Trinidad, Cayenne. Others—Dominica, Nicaragua, Venzuela, Colombia—are chronically revolutionary, persistently anti-Yankee. Farther south, but not too far to exercise a powerful influence on Caribbean affairs if the nazi technique of gradual encirclement were applied there, lies Brazil, already the seat of a pan-German, pro-fascist movement.

At present, we are practically without defense against axis political activity in these places, or against the sudden military stroke that follows a political upheaval, or against the violent direct attack that treads on the heels of the military seizure. Our insignificant army—six regular divisions, with equipment for three—could hardly make a conquest in any of these countries, even were it spared from home defense. An axis victory this summer, followed by a lightning stroke into the Caribbean, would find us reduced to the

dangerous expedient of calling in the navy from the Pacific, and the probably futile one of counter-attack by air—the methods used by England in Norway and the lowlands.

It is true that our fleet would be of more use to us than England's was to her. The sea-lanes from Europe are long, and even the axis has nothing to compare with our naval air service. Nevertheless, and in view of the fact that the attack may come in several directions at once, our obvious necessity is to supplement the existing measures with others sufficient to make the third stage in the process—the attack on the American homeland—impossibly difficult. This means air force and army; but how much? It is probable that there will be little agreement on the question, but a certain approximation can be arrived at from the fact that before the war in Europe the initial protective force seen as necessary while a large-scale emergency army was being raised was set at 647,000 men—227,000 regulars, 420,000 national guards.

The numerical requirements presumably need some slight revision upward, in view of the ease with which total war spans sea-gaps by means of air and surprise. But suppose they do not; European experience demonstrates so radical a change in the technical and equipment demands that the national guard is thrown back to the level of the emergency army as a force that would only be useful during the later stages of a three or four-year war. That is, the minimum protective requirement for our home soil is a standing army. fully equipped, at least three times the size of the present one, and an air force to match. The President's 50,000 planes are not too many; they will yield only about 15,000 combat machines.

This flatly means conscription. The more attractive naval and air services have already exhausted the volunteer crop. With conscription raising the army to IPF requirements, and provided we are granted the two or three years necessary to equip and to train an army, we can defend the continental United States—probably with a good deal of damage to the physical plant of the country, and certainly with a great deal of damage to its social, political and economic structure. But for full defense, hemisphere defense against the devices of totalitarian war, with its encroachment by easy stages, we need far more than the IPF. Probably a standing army of a hundred divisions—more than 1,500,000 men—would not be too much, though all figures are guesswork at present.

Yet the fundamental requirement is not for men or material, but for an entire recasting of the national mental pattern; the abandonment of that sentimental, string-glove pacifism which has been as much the mark of the American people as it was of the Chamberlain cabinet.

If this is a plunge into militarism, then at least it is a militarism of our own choice, whose development we may reasonably hope to control through the democratic process, instead of the gloomy and terrible militarism now being imposed on the other democracies by an enemy already within the gates.

MOBILIZING U. S. MAN POWER

(Excerpts from an article by Robert Strausz-Hupe in Current History, volume 51, pages 32-36, August, 1940.)

In 1938, at the time of the Munich surrender to Germany, every country in the western world—except two—trained its citizens to participate in national defense either as soldiers or workers. Those two exceptions were Great Britain and the United States.

On April 27, four months before war broke out, Britain too made military training compulsory, and the United States stood alone. When German troops in 1940 smashed their way to most of Europe's Atlantic seaboard, the people of the United States, in sudden anxiety, took stock of their military establishment. It was then much as it had been for twenty years. It consisted of the world's second strongest navy and one of the world's smallest armies. In peace time it supplemented its strength by the voluntary services of patriotic citizens.

The scope and power of European warfare made these efforts seem inadequate. There is now little likelihood that the United States will long retain its unique position among nations. Before long for the first time in history, we shall probably make military training in peace time compulsory for American youth.

To defend itself, on domestic or foreign soil, America needs a fighting force equipped for totalitarian war. Primarily, the problem of American defense is one of mobilizing manpower. Neither industry, now being geared to the needs of defense, nor the fighting forces themselves can hit the pace required by the present defense program without the mobilization of additional manpower.

On the supply of labor at the disposal of the war industries, official figures are not published. But the present strength and the authorized strength of the fighting forces are public knowledge. The navy's personnel consists of 156,500 officers and men; the planned strength is 182,000. For the army corresponding figures are 242,648 and 375,000; for the reserves 157,000 and 192,000; for the national guard 245,500 and 251,000. Two thousand eight hundred fully trained pilots fly for the army; 2,602 for the navy. An increase to 7,000 is planned for the army and with air cadets now in training the navy will dispose of 16,000 flyers. The total effectives of all branches are 650,050 with approximately 100,000 planned and authorized additions. There are, furthermore, 300,000 graduates of civilian military training camps, and 186,750 students were enrolled in last year's reserve officers training corps. Such is the inventory of U. S. manpower under arms or available for service at short notice.

Measured by the standards of the great military powers of Europe, these figures are small. It is estimated that, at the end of September, 1939, France and Germany each had 5,000,000 first line troops and trained reserves. Russia boasts of 13,000,000 regulars and reserves in a population only one-third larger than that of the United States. Italy claims that she put 3,000,000 fully trained and equipped troops in the field on June 10 when she went to war against France and Britain.

The forces of the United States seem especially small in view of the vast areas in which they must operate. Just what these areas may prove to be is still uncertain. But General George C. Marshall's recent suggestion of a 100,000-man increase in the army's enlisted strength took into consideration the requirements for (1) garrisoning outlying bases in the Caribbean and the Pacific, (2) dispatching an expeditionary force in case of invasion from abroad and "fifth column" troubles anywhere in this hemisphere, and (3) repelling enemy attempts at landing on U. S. soil. The U. S. navy and its air force would have something forceful to say about such attempts. But General Marshall's proposal of nine modern infantry divisions, one cavalry, and one mechanized division provide a field force sufficiently strong to deal with whatever force another power could transport across either ocean today.

"Today"—but what of tomorrow? It is up to the fighting services to envisage all possible combinations of hostile powers and all possible emergencies. After the allies' reverses in the lowlands, many theretofore improbable situations won the attention of the matter-of-fact American defense experts.

At this moment, the South American nations can put no more than 300,000 first line troops in the field. And their combined naval forces consist of three aging battleships, three new cruisers, about thirty destroyers and twenty submarines—no match for any of the world's great naval powers. The equipment of their air and land forces is second-best, which in combat against superior equipment proves of next to no use at all. A cool analysis of hemisphere strategy indicates that responsibility for the defense of the whole American hemisphere may rest squarely on the United States.

The President's request for authority to order the national guard into federal service during a recess of Congress drew attention to the role the militia must play in home defense and in strengthening an expeditionary force. Not even General Marshall's proposed increases will enable the regular army to man the anti-aircraft defenses of the continental United States. It has been suggested, therefore, that certain national guard regiments be transformed into anti-aircraft regiments, relieving the regular army of the job of providing anti-aircraft protection for towns and factories. English territorials with "militia" training apparently make good crews for anti-aircraft batteries fool-proofed by mechanical fire direction.

Fortunately, the expansion of both regular army and national guard will not be impeded by too few officers. When the United States entered the first World War the reserve of officers totaled 2,900. Today it is 103,000. To reserve officer training corps training in colleges, academies, and high schools must be given credit for the increase.

According to a recent survey 186,750 men enrolled for R. O. T .C. training in the academic year ending June, 1940. Every twelfth university and college offers military training. Most of the enrollees take the basic two-year course, but roughly 5 per cent are graduated from the four-year course qualifying them for reserve officer commissions. About half of the

136 colleges and universities having R. O. T. C. training make it a required subject for the first two years, and elective subject for the last two. In the others it is on a voluntary basis.

Despite widespread distrust of "boy-militarism" in many circles, both junior and senior R. O. T. C. have grown steadily since the World War, showing an increase of 20 per cent in the past two years.

The size of today's reserve of officers is a manifest improvement over 1917. Yet some observers hold that the instruction of reserve officers by correspondence courses and a two weeks' annual service period in summer does not afford that intensive training required by the complex methods of modern warfare.

And some experts feel that all these measures, good enough as far as they go, still fail to solve the problem of how to mobilize American manpower. Impressed by Europe's examples of democratic fumbling and totalitarian efficiency, they believe that the solution cannot be found in volunteers. Forthrightly, they advocate a national system of compulsory military training. For only a law requiring each citizen to take his place in his country's organization for war is equitable to all and, therefore, truly democratic. Only universal service allowing for orderly mobilization and training assures national teamwork and meets the totalitarian challenge.

UNIVERSAL TRAINING

(An article carried under a Washington, D. C. date line, in the New York Times for July 1, 1940.)

Senator Burke, Nebraska Democrat, who recently introduced the compulsory military training bill, and Senator Capper, Kansas Republican, headed opposing sides in a debate on the Forum of the Air tonight over the network of the Mutual Broadcasting System on the subject: "Shall We Have Compulsory Selective Military Training and Service Now?"

Senator Burke, who was supported by Colonel "Wild Bill" Donovan of the "Fighting 69th" and Colonel John Thomas Taylor, director of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, advocated immediate compulsory military training.

Senator Capper, who was supported by Representatives Hamilton Fish of New York, ranking Republican member of the foreign relations committee, and Representative Lee E. Geyer, California Democrat, opposed compulsory military training in peace time, but favored it in time of war.

Senator Burke declared that world events had proved conclusively that there was no substitute for the strength to repel an aggressor.

"We have been told that if we will mind our own business we have nothing to fear," he said. "So thought Holland and Belgium and many others."

Asserting that, "we dare not rest our hope of continued safety from attack by sea upon the supremacy of the British fleet," he discussed what he declared to be the alternative to compulsory military training.

Years would be required to build a two-ocean navy, he said, the construction cost would be staggering, maintenance an overwhelming burden, and there was no assurance that the personnel for the ships could be obtained by voluntary enlistment.

To man the 50,000 planes the President had suggested, he added, would require 1,000,000, and such a force could not be maintained by the volunteer method alone.

A standing army strong enough to make this country immune from attack would also be a staggering financial burden, he continued, and since an intensive recruiting campaign for the existing regular army in the first five months of this year had brought only 14,000 enlistments, there was no reason to believe that a larger standing army could be maintained on a voluntary basis.

The proposal that every able-bodied male inhabitant of the United States between the ages of 18 and 65 be made subject to selective military training in time of peace and service in time of war was in line, he declared, with the essential principles of democracy, and that along with the privileges of a free society shared by all alike, obligations and responsibilites must rest upon all in equal measure, not the young alone but the middle-aged as well, rich and poor, the timid along with the venturesome.

Those between 18 and 21 and 45 and 65, he added, would be liable for service only in home and defense units, those from 21 to 45 for full military or naval service.

Senator Capper, in endorsing selective universal military service in time of war, asserted:

"In case of war we will have labor battalions as well as fighting men and those in the service of supply. In case of war, conscription of labor and of capital, conscription of all resources and all services, is as logical as conscription of men for active military service."

He declared, however, that the idea of universal conscription for military service in time of peace was "very repugnant" to him.

"It strikes at the heart of personal liberty and personal freedom," he went on. "But in the face of realities I must admit that we are today afflicted with a peace which is not peace; we are not at war, but we are in a position where it is necessary to prepare for national defense. Therefore I am ready to examine into the pros and cons of conscription for military training—even here I will have to be shown it is necessary.

"But when it is proposed that we conscript for universal government service, including labor battalions—I can place no other construction upon the President's proposal and upon Senator Burke's bill—I must say that at the present time and under present conditions, I am very strongly opposed to the idea.

"In the first place, let's be realistic. We face the possibility, granted even the probability, that the United States may be forced into war at some time in the future; I think we can keep out now if we want to.

"If it becomes necessary to conscript men for universal military train-

ing, I probably will support such a move. But I am opposed to rushing in at this time and adopting a system of universal governmental service.

"I think the proposal to draft all boys and girls of this country into federal training camps—including labor battalions—is a startling example of the wrong way to reach national preparedness. These training camps for youth, these labor battalions for public works, are the methods of Hitler and Stalin. They are not American.

"We need more trained technicians. We need more trained mechanics. We can get these through vocational schools, voluntarily attended, with an extension perhaps of federal aid already extended for this work. We can get them through private industry encouraged to function instead of being browbeaten into inaction.

"I say give our young men and women opportunities to train themselves, to discipline themselves, rather than rush wildly into a program of enforced training in military and labor camps."

COMPULSORY TRAINING

(Editorial in the Raleigh News and Observer for July 25, 1940.)

Now that Congress appears about to enact legislation providing for compulsory military training, it is important that the measure be carefully studied and fully debated.

Careful study is in order, for in legislation of this character details may be much more important than the broad objective. In much of the preparedness legislation, it is both desirable and necessary that Congress rely upon army officers for advice as to details for the simple reason that civilians are not qualified to pass on questions involved. But that is not true of a conscription bill. Such a measure affects a very large percentage of the civilian population. After these civilians are turned over to the army for training, the army will have to assume responsibility for that training and should be given a reasonably free hand in meeting that responsibility. The order and method of selection are questions which should be answered with full regard for the civilian viewpoint and even the question of the proper size of an army to meet defense needs is one on which the answer of the army should not be accepted without investigation.

The measure should be fully debated, to the end that it may be understood by the affected. The impression should not be created that all those registered for service will be actually called for training. Nor should those who register be led to believe that they will be exempt from duty in any contingency, if that is not actually the case.

One portion of the pending bill can be accepted without argument. That is the portion calling for universal registration of those of an age to perform military or semi-military service. It is highly important that there be accurate and detailed knowledge respecting the manpower at the disposal of the nation, and registration offers the best means of obtaining that information.

It probably will develop that conscription will be necessary to bring the trained personnel of the armed forces to the number considered adequate for preparedness in the light of the present world situation. Even if there should be no actual conscription, registration would be desirable as a precautionary measure.

The voluntary system for raising armies is preferable, but the voluntary system carries with it the right of the individual to select the branch of the service he will join, which is not always the one in which he is most needed or for which he is best suited.

Modern warfare requires elaborate equipment. It also requires highly trained men to use that equipment. It would be folly for this nation to spend billions of dollars in equipping its army and navy and not, at the same time, train a sufficient number of men in the use of that equipment. Scrupulous care should be taken to see to it that no more men are removed from their normal pursuits than are needed and that those called are selected in the most equitable manner that can be devised, with the good of the whole nation always placed foremost.

DRAFT EXCEPTION IN COLLEGE ASKED

(Excerpts from an article by H. W. Chase in the New York Times for September 1, 1940.)

This has been a difficult summer for universities, as it has been for the young men dependent upon them. The enactment of a bill providing for selective compulsory military service will deeply affect universities, as it will their clientele. And yet, as the debate has drawn on through the summer neither they nor their clientele have been able to plan very definitely for the months ahead.

We at New York University believe that the President's advice to college students is sound: that they should pursue their normal plans unless and until there is reason to change them. We have sent out a letter containing such advice to all our students within the age brackets which would be affected. We have definitely taken the position, moreover, that no New York University student should be penalized financially by his institution in case he enters military service.

But, in spite of all the uncertainty, I am glad that the debate is prolonged. I speak as one in favor of the bill. But we are confronted by one of the most far-reaching changes in national policy in our history, and it is good that there should be full debate and discussion, full opportunity for that freedom of discussion which in such matters is the essence of democratic procedures. Those of us who are affected by the delay, whether we are military people or university people or business people, ought not to become too impatient at the working of those democratic methods we are asking our countrymen to defend.

I am, I repeat, in favor of compulsory selective military service. I have come very reluctantly to that position. During the last 21 years I have

been the administrative head of three universities. I remember only too well the profound disruption caused among college students by the coming of the World War draft—a disruption so deep that army and navy and colleges and universities are heartily agreed that, even in the event of another war, nothing like it shall be allowed to happen again.

I do not believe that reliance on volunteer service is either fair or effective. The traditional pressures in directions other than the service of arms are very strong. I see nothing undemocratic about the principle of compulsory military service. Every citizen owes an obligation to his country and, in a period of storm and stress, there is nothing incompatible with the ideals of democracy if, for some of our citizens, that obligation is translated into a term of service with our armed forces.

FITTING YOUNG HANDS TO THE SWORD

(An editorial in the Greensboro Daily News for June 22, 1940.)

Military training of all the youth of the country, for a year, say, has in it so much of potential good and of potential evil that it could be argued indefinitely. And maybe it will be.

Such measures will be necessary, under these conditions: A final mastery of Europe by the dictatorships, the refusal of that mastery to enter engagements to keep hands off this hemisphere, a reasonable doubt of the dependableness of such engagements if made.

The first service that a gesture of that nature would be expected to render would be that of warning. The authoritarians have both theoretical and practical knowledge of the power of a defensive or offensive organization that starts with the cradle, regimenting the childhood of the country in obedience, in devotion, in fervent support of an idea, of a system, of the fashioners and directors of that system.

The primary military force of a nation, its human beings, is in this way developed to its highest possibilities. A million freemen springing to arms over night is a formidable power; a million citizens trained, in body and mind, during their formative years to the uses of soldiery is a much more formidable. More is done for, or to, them, than to give them soldierly bodies and soldierly minds; they become soldierly souls.

The disciplined, unified service of the state becomes a religion. It becomes *the* religion of the people. It is not the sort of religion that has hitherto been acceptable to the consciences and the minds of Americans; at least, as one in which the children ought to be brought up.

What is contemplated is a draft of all men, for such service as may be assigned to them; and with respect to the regimentation of the young men, their drilling will not be all of a warlike character but will include a variety of tasks. But whether this enforced training-service is in squads right and left, in the manual of arms, or the use of the machines of peaceful industry, it will come to the same thing, that of a unified preparation to serve the manifold activities incident to war.

Drafting the adult male population will be nothing new under the American sun. Drafting any portion of them in a time other than one of war will be without precedent, certainly except as to local, limited emergency situations.

YOUTH ACCEPTS CONSCRIPTION WITHOUT SERIOUS OPPOSITION

(Editorial in the Gastonia Daily Gazette for October 1, 1940.)

Prior to the passage of the conscription bill, the cry was repeatedly raised that American youth seriously opposed the draft. Yet a Gallup poll revealed that 68 per cent of American boys between 21 and 24 were willing to give a year of their lives to military training. Eighty-one per cent in the 16 to 21 age group expressed willingness to serve.

This did not stop the small but vociferous anti-conscription bloc, however, and the accuracy of the poll was questioned. Today the poll stands vindicated, as opposition to the draft has died to a whisper, and at every hand new evidence presents itself pointing to the willingness of youth to accept military service.

True, there is little enthusiastic shouting. But this is not generally considered a sign of opposition. Rather, it is considered by many as a sign of strength—a sign that youth realizes that it has a job to do and is seriously going about the business of preparing to defend America.

It is hoped that this is the true state of affairs, for the strength of Germany, Italy, Japan, and Russia is built upon youth. The young men of these countries have been sold the philosophy that the state is all powerful, and are fanatically trying to force this philosophy upon the whole world.

American youth must be sold the idea that freedom is worth fighting for. They must realize that democracy was purchased at a great price—that it is workable—that it is preferable to the regimentation that stifles individual freedom of thought and action.

Today, as the young men of America prepare to serve their country, there is every indication that they realize their responsibility, and accept it willingly. They realize that liberty must be bought with sacrifice, gladly and freely made.

American youth is waking up.

ADD: CONSCRIPTION

(Editorial in the Greensboro Daily News for August 7, 1940.)

Without being dogmatic about it, the Daily News would like to ask why there could not be placed in the conscription bill now before the Congress a provision to call into some branch of the military service of the United States every bachelor of arts or of science immediately after graduation.

It is from able-bodied young men who have been exposed to the best—and perhaps worst—features of American higher education that we are expecting to secure results in industry, commerce and the professions. Why should they not be utilized for the national defense?

If there is fighting to be done, they'll have to do their full share of it. There can be no better time to prepare them for this than before they have become immersed in the professions or private enterprise. And if there is anything to be said in favor of discipline, they'll be far better fitted to approach the business of making a living after the army or navy has corrected some of the mistaken notions so often acquired at bull sessions, week-end dances and beach house parties.

Making the national defense a part of the educational system sounds like sense to us. Could it not be better arrived at through a year of intensive training at or around the age of 21 years than by trying to fit it in with four years of classroom, athletic field, library, and ballroom activities?

Mind you, we are not suggesting that all of these lads be given officers' commissions at the end of a year's service. There'd be some A students, Bs, Cs, Ds and, just as among the candidates for degrees, many who couldn't make the grade.

But it couldn't be called unjust discrimination to require of the most privileged class of young men the first evidence of the willingness to serve.

And think of how employers and fellow-workmen upon whom will devolve the responsibility of helping these lads adjust themselves to the matter-of-fact living would rejoice to have them report for duty realizing that the boss generally gets that way by knowing what it's about.

AS CONSCRIPTION TAKES HOLD

(Editorial in the Greensboro Daily News for September 18, 1940.)

Peacetime conscription, yielding for the moment the controverted question of whether or not these actually be peacetimes, is all but a *fait accompli* in these United States. With the draft measure passed by the Congress and signed by the President, all that remains is the actual summoning of the draftees and their formal induction into the armed forces of the nation.

The American public, the Daily News conceives, basing that conception on observation, widespread individual and group expressions and tabulations of the various public opinion polls which have been taken, is largely in accord with the action which has been voted and the sentiments expressed by Mr. Roosevelt in a formal statement incidental to affixation of his signa-

ture to the unprecedented legislation. The American people have witnessed the tragic fate of unprepared countries and, cognizant of the menace which faces surviving democracy, have revised many of their previous views and beliefs in the light of stern realities. Since preparedness has been agreed upon, the draft must be accepted as the surest, quickest and most democratic, assuming that its execution will be carried out fairly and impartially, way of manning the defense establishment.

From this angle President Roosevelt's emphasis is basically true. At the same time, however, it should be unnecessary to remind the American people that there are inherent dangers in any military program, that their ideals should be kept alive pending the arrival of a better and brighter day and that eternal vigilance is more than ever a needed quality for the preservation of certain rights and prerogatives which any extensive military movement tends to subordinate, and jeopardize accordingly. Mr. Roosevelt touched upon this danger, if unwittingly, in commenting upon the preliminary period in which the draftees will be "physically hardened, mentally disciplined and properly trained in fundamentals." "Mentally disciplined" is a phrase which will bear continuous watching. It implies a restricted, subservient and controlled mind which, while perhaps necessary for a soldier's life and duty, nevertheless clashes sharply with further assurance that "universal service will bring . . . a wider distribution of tolerance. . . ." We truly wish that we could be sure of that contribution; heretofore it has been our observation that tolerance is the very first casualty of war and the military spirit.

NATION'S ARMED STRENGTH

(Excerpts from an article in the New York Times for September 1, 1940.)

Even before the first conscript is put into khaki, it seemed likely that the nation's total armed forces would reach 1,000,000 men. This potential figure included the national guard and other army reserves, who will be subject to a year's active service under a bill signed last week by President Roosevelt. The number now available—a number that is rapidly being swelled by volunteer recruiting—is constituted as follows (officers and men):

Navy	154,516
Marines	31,379
Navy reserves	40,336
Marine reserves	15,076
Army	303,000
National guard	238,000
Army reserve officers	120,000
Enlisted reserves	17,500
Last week's total	919,807

AFFIRMATIVE REFERENCES

EVERY BOY A SOLDIER

(An article by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., with Beverly Smith, in the American Magazine, volume 130, pages 16, 156-157, September, 1940.)

We are witnessing one of the great convulsions of history, such as man has endured every century or so in the past. No man can tell how it will end. But for some time to come Americans will know what it is to live dangerously, as our ancestors used to do.

We need clear thinking and firm decision. We have made a beginning by appropriating some billions of dollars to produce new weapons. But weapons alone are not enough. It would be folly to overlook the brilliant skill with which the Germans handle their equipment. Thorough training is the secret of their "secret weapons." Americans must now decide how we are to train the skilled men to handle our new weapons of defense.

The apparatus of the modern army includes most of the apparatus of modern life: telephone and radio, photography and light, planes and motors, transport, communication, and repair.

Consequently, young men *cannot* be trained for this new military science without also being trained in useful civilian skills. Some picture military training in terms of the cantonments of 1917-18. Although, of course, the men would always have to live as soldiers, training today is a very different matter. Part of it will be in the shops where the mechanical equipment is made and repaired. We can enlist the cooperation of the entire industry of the United States in supplying training facilities.

Germany was favored by the fact that she was the most mechanically-minded nation in Europe. America starts with more general mechanical knowledge than Germany ever had; our problem is to apply a sufficiency of this to military science.

For some time I had been thinking along these lines.

In May, while the Germans slashed swiftly through the supposedly impregnable defense lines in northern France, I was serving as a reserve officer in our regular army maneuvers in Louisiana. What I saw there, excellent but tiny against the European background, made me realize the imperative need for an expansion of our army so that it would be large enough to make a major effort immediately—without the tragic and paralyzing delays which so impeded the allies.

An expansion of the army raises the problem of industrial mobilization so that the weapons may be produced. It also raises the question of procuring the manpower to furnish the needed increase. Some suggested that the increase should be obtained by voluntary enlistment—from many standpoints a desirable method, if it will bring results and bring them fast enough. Others suggested militarizing the CCC. It seemed to me that to this there were many objections, the gravest of which was that it would single out boys for combat service simply because they were in moderate circumstances financially.

A far better system, more democratic and more efficient, would be a system of universal military training. To me this was the preferable plan, and I believe I was the first in this Congress to urge it. What I have in mind is quite distinct from a draft to enlarge the regular army, or even to train men of all ages for immediate emergency, necessary as this is today. It is, rather, a long-range plan of peacetime military training; a preparation of youth for the new world we are living in. I would like to explain my reasons, for such a measure would defeat its own purpose in America unless it had the general consent of the people.

In my opinion the time has come when every able-bodied young man, "rich, poor, and middling," should be trained to aid in the defense of the country.

I consider this an obvious necessity for the national safety. I believe, from my own experience, that it will be a definite benefit to the young men themselves. And I am convinced that, properly administered, it will nourish the spirit, health, and comradeship of our democratic institutions. Discipline which we freely impose upon ourselves is the opposite of, and the best protection against, a dictatorial or fascist discipline imposed from outside or above.

First, as to the military necessity. Since the World War, our regular army has stressed quality rather than quantity. It has been a laboratory for the development of military science. It has kept abreast of military knowledge. The method of the "blitzkreig" was pretty accurately forecast to me by American officers as far back as 1933, when I was serving a tour of duty with the mechanized brigade at Fort Knox—though I think the scale and precision of it has startled us all.

The idea was that this small but expert army would be rapidly expanded, in case of war, so that in three months we would have a protective force adequate to repel any attack.

Three months—that seemed pretty fast. Now it seems absurdly slow. A masked, modern, surprise attack on some remote coast of our continent may not give us three months', or three weeks', or three days', or three hours' notice. Our regular army, much larger than now, must be ready to roll with a speed comparable to that of a fire company answering a five-bell alarm. Part of this army will be ready to move by great transport planes, carrying along not only artillery, anti-aircraft, and supplies, but even light tanks.

Back of the ever-poised regular army, however, we must have a citizen army and reserves, trained in all the hard and complex skills which the new war of machines demands.

It is for this supporting army and reserve that we must resort to the training which only universal service can supply. That training should be given, in my opinion, between the ages of 18 and 19. Some may feel that this is too tender an age for the severe arts of the soldier. But that is the age when a youngster is best adapted to the physical and athletic training required. It is a time when, usually, he has not settled down to regular work, and so his life trade or profession is not interrupted. It is a period

when he most easily learns difficult mechanical skills—skills, incidentally, which may be of great value to him in earning his living. And he is young enough to take a certain sporting pride and pleasure in the hardships which go with military training. Those who go to West Point and Annapolis generally begin their strenuous training at 18.

It is estimated that slightly over a million boys reach the age of 18 during each year. Of these, perhaps 6 or 8 hundred thousand would measure up to the standards of physical fitness for training. Each boy would be given, so far as possible, a choice of the services he desired, whether in aviation or in mechanized divisions, the navy or marine corps; whether in photography or radio or motor repair; whether as a pilot, driver, or mechanic.

(As this article was written, international events were moving at such a rapid pace that both Senator Lodge and the editor realized his proposed plan, or one like it, might be enacted before publication.)

As I say, I think the conservation work of the CCC should be separate from military training. Boys could serve in the CCC before age 18 or after age 19.

Some who want universal training consider it a "dreadful necessity." I do not see it so. A necessity, yes. But for one who loves his country it is honorable to spend a year in training for its defense. In recent years all of us in America, talking about our rights, have tended to forget the duties which accompany and make those rights possible.

Even if the country were in no danger of attack, I would consider general military training valuable to the individual and to the nation.

During the last eleven years that I have served in the army maneuvers, I have noticed the steadily rising requirements in individual initiative, judgment, and technical skill, among officers as well as the enlisted men.

For example, when tanks are released for their mission, they almost immediately get out of the close control of the regimental commander. Every tank is an independent unit, commanded by a sergeant, a corporal, or even a private, who goes on to achieve his mission as best he can. These tank commanders must acquire a sense of generalship and a full understanding of the military objective, yet they are enlisted men.

In the mechanized regiment with which I served, every man, whether a driver or a mechanic or a radioman, must know the intricate mechanics of at least four weapons.

During the recent maneuvers I saw young men sitting under the trees in Louisiana forests doing trigonometry and logarithms to calculate the location of "enemy" artillery. These men were not college graduates nor commissioned officers. They were enlisted men.

Following a torrential downpour of rain in Louisiana, our mechanized brigade found lowlands turned into soupy bogs. I saw a force of men, in two hours, throw a bridge across these bogs which safely carried the rumbling 10-ton tanks. The bridge was built by enlisted men.

I saw telephone systems set up in the field, with a portable telephone exchange enabling the commanding general to talk to all of his commanders

immediately upon his arrival. I saw a constant use of radio communication in planes and in tanks, operated and maintained by enlisted men.

I saw the complex and specialized engine of a tank completely disemboweled; and there, in a little clearing under a pine tree, an operation was performed on it which in our civilian life is done only in a factory. This was done by enlisted men.

Those are just a few examples. But they show the variety of skills required.

Not long ago, in The American Magazine, Mr. William Knudsen wrote that if he were a youngster again he would be a mechanic. He pointed out that, even if a man were later to work at a desk or a profession, an early training in skilled manual work was a valuable contribution to rounded character and straight thinking. A year of the new kind of military training would give somewhat of a foundation to most young men.

Apart from mechanical skills, proper military training will give schooling in neatness, alertness, discipline, sanitation, and self-care, first-aid to self and others, efficient working habits, administrative direction of troop or company, and, most importantly, the development of a rugged physique.

In the old days military training was too often a matter of dreary drilling in barrack towns, "spit and shine," boredom, repetition, and a good deal of loafing. Such training is useless today.

We still need a certain amount of drill, of course. But the emphasis now is on speed and movement. We don't want a "standing army," but a rolling, flying, striking army. That means a great deal more time devoted to maneuver, to large-scale work over country. Too many of us know only the concrete highways. The boys must learn the character of the fields and forests and rivers of this country we are to defend.

They must know not only the iron innards of their tank, mobile howitzer, or armored car, but how it will behave in mountains, in tidewater sand, in canebrakes; in sleet, blizzards, and steaming summer heat. If European troops can fight from Mediterranean shores to the arctic cliffs back of Narvik, ours must be ready from Alaska to the Panama Canal.

Or perhaps we should amend that to "from Greenland's icy mountains to West Indies' coral strand." And right here I think we ought to make it clear that we are not training these boys to fight in Europe. It should be our declared national policy that we are to defend this continent and its essential outposts; to make that defense so strong that no successful attack on us will be possible.

The better we do this training job, the less likely it is that we shall have to fight. If we don't do it, and attack comes, it may be long and bloody business to repel it, with hundreds of thousands of our youth going bravely to the slaughter which poor training invites.

But what, it may be asked, will this universal training do to our democratic way of life? Will it lead us down the road to fascism, to totalitarianism? To my mind it will have the contrary effect.

In the first place, there is no contradiction between preparedness and

democracy. The very men who founded our republic were trained to gun and saddle. Their marksmanship, physical endurance, and knowledge of the country were superb.

Military training, properly conducted, would not hurt our democracy. Rather it would knit and strengthen it. In the last 20 years there have been rifts and cleavages of spirit. Class has been set against class. Farm and city have grown suspicious of each other.

Now, of course, military training won't *cure* all that. But at least it will bring all our young men together in a common purpose on which all are agreed—defense. It will get this country, all classes and sections, acquainted with itself again.

It was not until I had my military training, working under difficulty and hardship with men of every background, that I really appreciated the texture and quality of our people. That meant a lot to me, and made me proud, and I think every youngster should have that experience and privilege.

If this training is to be a democratic process there must be no loopholes by which youngsters with money or pull can escape their year of duty. All who are physically qualified must serve, whether Pop is a sharecropper, a corporation magnate, a WPA worker, or President of the United States. And serve under the same conditions, without any special privileges or luxuries.

The creation of such a system of training will not be cheap or easy. It will take fairness, constructive imagination, and good will if we are to make this a vital force for the health as well as the defense of our country.

Thus defended we can proceed, with good heart and without foreign interruption, to make this country, in all its freedom and variety, an ever better place to live in for all its citizens.

DRAFT LAW VITAL, GENERAL DRUM ASSERTS

(Text of a statement by Lieutenant-General Hugh A. Drum, U. S. Army, which appeared in the New York Times for July 10, 1940.)

American citizens are increasingly aware of an awakened interest in national defense. More than ever before, citizens of our great American communities have turned their thoughts toward prompt and complete realization of a national program that will insure American security. History shows that this security question is not a new problem for the United States. It is true that today we face necessities which require new considerations, if we are to secure adequate defense forces, but it must be remembered that more than 150 years ago our forefathers faced just as urgent necessities. The solution which they eventually found proved adequate for the needs which they faced. Today every patriotic citizen is directing his efforts toward securing a successful solution to the same problems in the light of the present world situation.

Foremost among the important major recommendations which the Con-

gress is considering are proposals for universal military service. Current comment throughout the country centers upon the novelty of such proposals. Some critics emphasize that universal military service would introduce a change in our American way of life. Many who oppose the idea classify universal military service as un-American and contrary to our democratic way of life. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In colonial days separate colonies organized militia, and later duty in the militia of the several states became an obligation and a privilege for the new American citizens. Washington's armies, small in number, were the result of state militia groups raised within the borders of each state, and joined together for federal service in the common cause of protecting the new republic. Our federal constitution under its provisions for "common defense" established the doctrine of a militia comprising all able-bodied male citizens between 18 and 45 years of age.

The first secretary of war under the constitution introduced a specific provision for a national militia. Secretary Knox called for an armed force composed of those citizens who by virtue of the citizenship alone were eligible for membership in the defense forces of the nation. Ample provisions existed in the new constitution to support the Knox plan for a national militia. The framers of the constitution unanimously supported the principle that all citizens accepted the obligation to bear arms in defense of the new liberties they had secured. Within the body of the constitution, the concept of universal military service was established, leaving the scope and application to be decided as the varying circumstances of our national life might dictate.

Our forefathers accepted the idea that this principle was a self-evident truth and required no limitation or definition, any more than the unchallenged words which established that a free people had founded a free government, and that human liberty was the goal sought by all. No definition was required to explain who "the people" were; no question was raised as to what "liberty" meant; no challenge was voiced as to the meaning of the word "free."

These honorable words, complete in their own meaning, acceptable to every liberty-loving patriot within the framework of the new constitution, and that document, embodying as it still does, the hopes and aspirations of a free people, encompassed as well with the grant of privilege its requirement of obligation.

There was then, as there is now, considerable difference of opinion as to the method which a free democratic people should follow in applying the principle of universal military service to the country. The doctrine of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" has too frequently overshadowed the principle of national obligation—too few have appreciated the necessity of national service to insure the existence of this fundamental democratic doctrine.

In great national emergencies, whether in the nature of floods, earthquakes, tornadoes or of economic depressions or internal or external conflicts, internal strifes or wars, we have found ourselves so unprepared that we have had to overcome such crises by extraordinary efforts, involving unneces-

sary human and financial losses. Success has ultimately been achieved by an early resurgence of a spirit of national service, the activation of which, prior to an emergency, would surely have been an insurance against such unnecessary losses. It is well to remember that, as our frontiers disappeared and our population increased, the majority of our citizens felt that minimum restrictions should be placed upon each citizen in the pursuit of his own individual opportunity in this new nation. From a national defense viewpoint, this conclusion has been particularly true.

In the War of 1812 and later during the War between the States, as a result of years of neglect in arriving at a common solution for the application of the principle of universal military service, the United States found itself seriously hampered in effectively and efficiently securing adequate manpower to protect our national interests. Only a casual reference to historical records of the country will show that during the campaigns, in 1812 particularly, serious military reverses resulted from the necessity of conducting defense with hastily organized, untrained militia forces, in the face of fewer but well trained, adequately equipped enemy forces. A similar situation existed in the northern forces at the outbreak of the War between the States. The best military thought on the subject at the time clearly established that, had the method of applying the principle of universal military service been adopted prior to, or at the time of these emergencies, these catastrophes might have been avoided.

Many will recall from personal experience or association with those who took part, the unnecessary casualties suffered by our defense forces during the Spanish-American war. Disease took its toll among the ranks of those men who had only short periods of improvised training. Lack of adequate plans for the continuous development of a properly trained and well organized force resulted once again in incurring heavy losses far beyond the necessities.

After more than forty years of service in the army of the United States, I can say that there has never been any occasion when this nation could not have accomplished its defense duties with more efficiency and economy, and with far less loss of human life, had our nation enforced a plan for universal military training. Furthermore, such a system of service is the only solution sufficiently democratic to insure an equitable distribution of the burden involved in such emergencies.

During the last World War we faced once again the problem of raising in a short space of time the largest army our nation has ever gathered together in the defense of our democratic principles. Distant battlefields across the seas, and the valiant efforts of our allies secured to us during that period a reasonable length of time in which to solve the problems of that war. Training camps were established for officer personnel, and large forces of men were trained for service overseas. As a result of a united effort, and in combination with our allies, an American army was organized, equipped, trained, transported, and led into battle in the greatest successful effort this country has ever accomplished. Although it took a year and a half to place an American army in battle, we were convinced that victory had graced our

arms only because we had found a solution to the problem of securing adequate national defense in the face of a major emergency—i.e., by universal military training and effort.

In the last twenty years we have modified our appreciation of the word "victory" as applied to our participation during the last World War. We modified too in those years our understanding of the fundamental necessities which this nation must adopt if we are to be adequately prepared to defend our democratic institutions. The armed forces of the nation were seriously reduced in numbers, and funds for their adequate maintenance were curtailed during the twenty-year period that has followed the last World War.

Despite the provisions of the National Defense act of 1920, the nation still failed to take into consideration the necessity for providing continuous military training for all young Americans, and making adequate provision for modern weapons. Today all of us are concerned with this proposal, and I think that this brief review of historical facts has established that it is not a new problem, but an old and ever-present problem which we and all other democracies have faced or are facing at this moment. We are now facing a duty that we are asked to discharge to the nation—the duty of deciding how we shall apply promptly and efficiently the constitutional and democratic principle that we, as citizens, are obliged to defend the democratic institutions we are privileged to enjoy.

Let us study this question in the light of the rigid requirements of the technique of modern warfare. Visualize for a moment the technical problems involved in the operations of airplanes—air fighters, bombers, and observation planes. Think of the skill necessary, not only for their operation, but for their maintenance and production. Comparable are the other mechanical weapons—tanks, anti-aircraft, modern artillery, machine guns and other automatic weapons. Add to these requirements the skill demanded of modern infantrymen, including the individual and group courage and determination essential to face and see through to a successful conclusion modern combat.

With such thoughts in mind, do you feel that large numbers of untrained men, partially equipped, with little or no organization, can successfully cope with the modern professional armies abroad in the world today?

Aside from the question of obligation of national service, adequately trained defense forces to meet the demands of modern war cannot be created by the haphazard methods we have followed in the past. Experience has demonstrated again and again that large numbers of skilled soldiers cannot be produced under such a system.

Service of the nation in peace and war embraces many lines of endeavor other than purely military—production, agriculture, labor, welfare, and governmental forces are required, over and above normal numbers. But these are normal, every day pursuits, followed by millions of our people, whereas military service is exceptional, and involves such specialties peculiar to said service that the creation of this agency of the nation's security must be approached apart from the others, and must be given separate and distinct consideration. This conclusion is doubly sound in view of the possible emergencies facing us in the immediate future. No formless or vague provision

for general national service will produce in time the trained military forces essential in such crises. We are called upon to defend our institutions as they now stand, to be prepared to meet a possible immediate danger. These conditions demand special treatment to insure timely results.

From the strict view of our immediate need for national defense, I think the answers to all these questions are obvious.

If we are to secure with minimum delay adequate manpower to build our national defense to its essential requirement, then our main consideration should be directed toward securing manpower for military training. Any vocational activity, or any social adventure, no matter how well pursued, no matter how successfully accepted, will probably produce large numbers of desirable recruits for military service. But it must be remembered that these young men, in a military sense, will still be recruits; they will still be untrained and uninformed in military requirements, and without such knowledge, the advantages gained in other fields will be of little immediate military value.

It is essential that every American bring to his military service all other advantages which he may have acquired for the benefit of our country. However, it remains equally true that only through military training can these advantages be applied to the military necessities which the armed forces may have to face. The expenditure of large sums of money and the raising of large numbers of young Americans are not alone in themselves the solution of the problem of national defense. The production of necessary items of equipment and the training of adequate manpower in essential military duties are the only means and methods which will result in securing an efficient, well-equipped, well-trained and well-led defense force for this country.

The machinery of war has introduced new requirements which armed forces must master if they are to be successful in combat. Good intentions and brave words are desirable, but on the field of battle quiet determination to fight it out, backed up by adequate knowledge in the use of modern weapons, is essential for success.

Today our American Congress has enacted legislation which will provide large amounts of essential material for equipping an increased army and navy. It is imperative that prompt measures be taken to secure adequate manpower to be trained in the use of this equipment when it becomes available to our armed forces. There is no quarrel among us as to the need for immediate action. There should be no quarrel as to the method which must be adopted if we are to secure without delay adequate national defense. The principles which should receive our support are simple and easily secured.

These principles are imbodied in a recent Congressional proposal for universal military service of American men in the age group of 21 to 45, for brief periods of military service. This plan would provide an efficient method for rapidly acquiring large groups of physically fit men who could receive preliminary military instruction during the period required for American industry to produce essential modern equipment for their use. The production

of equipment and the training of manpower must go on hand in hand. They are companion pieces.

I believe that our American nation has always had within its own power the means to defend itself and to protect our American institutions. I believe that every American is determined to defend our American way of life. I believe that in our present emergency, our main concern is to adopt with all possible speed a simple, effective plan which shall insure the maximum degree of success in accomplishing the goal we all seek. I believe that any plan, regardless of its merit, which retards or delays in any way, the prompt realization of our essential adequate national defense requirements should be eliminated from our present considerations. I believe we face urgent needs today and that we must make sacrifices if we are to be successful in accomplishing national security.

And finally, I believe that our army and navy stand prepared to exert every effort, now as in the past, to see to it that our first duty, the defense of the land we love, shall be accomplished.

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

(Excerpts from an address by James W. Wadsworth, in the House of Representatives at Washington, September 4, 1940, as carried in the Congressional Record.)

War is always an exceedingly serious thing, even though it rage on the other side of the world. War in Europe, of course, is an even more serious thing to the people of the United States, for by indirection its effect is felt amongst us all; but, perhaps, because war has been so constant in greater or less degree during the last 10 or 15 years, I, and other men like me, pay not much attention to it, and I am conscious of the fact that I was not deeply stirred when the present conflict broke out on September 1, 1939. It seemed to me that it was pretty far away, although I recognized that it might have its reverberations here in the United States. I think I did not begin to feel deeply concerned about it, in its effect upon the safety of the United States potentially until the British and the French forces were driven out of Belgium, and I began to realize, as many of you did, the enormous power of the military and economic force back of that expulsion of the British and French armies from Belgium, resulting in the seizure of the Channel ports. Then I awoke to the fact, and I am sure you did too, that a new force was at large in the world and was progressing with giant steps. Then when France collapsed only a month later, it seemed to me then, and I believe it to be the fact, that the whole face of the world had changed, for with the collapse of France and the entry of Italy into the war on the side of Germany, we see the probability—indeed, it is more than a probability, it is almost a certainty —that the whole of the European continent is to be organized under one single control, Spain, France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Germany as at present constituted, and the Balkan states plus Italy, with the backing of Russia—the whole European continent subjected to a philosophy which,

to say the least, spells danger to the rest of the world. I visualize, as no doubt you do, the extent of the power which may rest in the hands of the men who rule all of Europe, military power, including air power and sea power, economic power and industrial power.

If it should turn out that one power shall dominate all Europe, assisted by another power which shall dominate all of the Far East, we shall have a state of affairs in this world never before equalled in the history of the race. I think I can say that advisedly. Much the greater portion of the civilized world will be living under a new philosophy, a philosophy that teaches that force and force alone is entitled to prevail in the affairs of human people. So I say that when France fell on or about June 12 or June 14, I personally became deeply concerned about the safety of the United States, and on June 21 I introduced this bill.

Now, what about the safety of the United States? We read in the literature of the nazis and the fascists, outspoken and brutally frank, that their next field of exploitation shall be South and Central America. This they have announced. Whether they carry out that threat or not none of us can tell, but that they have made that threat time and again cannot be denied, nor can we deny the fact that for some time past, and at this very hour, there are influences at work in South and Central America to undermine those governments and substitute for them new governments utterly devoted to the totalitarian system. With this thought in mind, my mind ran, and I have no doubt yours did, to the Monroe doctrine. It is the one policy of defense to which this country has adhered for 120 years. We adhere to it because we are convinced that its maintenance is essential to the safety of the United States. We cannot afford to take any chances about it—none whatsoever. If this huge collection of power dominant in Europe and in Asia is to carry out its program or to attempt to do so, we must be ready. And I judge that the Congress has already taken into consideration that possibility, in that by a vote which I think was nearly unanimous the Congress has provided for what is to be called a two-ocean navy. Now, obviously, we would not have done that had we not had in mind the very menace which I have attempted to describe. A two-ocean navy, why? It is because we fear a concentration against us from east and from west, because we realize that if the British navy were to fail, our present navy is not strong enough to guard us in both oceans. And may I say at this point also that control of the sea is now inseparably linked with control of the air.

For the same reason Congress has already authorized the appropriation of sums to greatly increase our air forces. So I think I am right in saying that the Congress, in action already taken, has taken into very serious consideration the possibilities of aggression against the Monroe doctrine, and in such aggression, against the United States. We have authorized that expansion in the navy. We have gone a long way toward authorizing that expansion in the naval aviation and in the army air corps. We have not yet provided for adequate expansion in the land forces. This bill is intended to accomplish that, and to accomplish it as simply as possible, with the least

disturbance possible in industry and agriculture and the professions and with the least burden placed upon the most men.

May I remind you that this is an emergency measure? It is not an attempt to establish a permanent policy in the United States. It is meant to meet, if it is possible to meet it, the immediate future and to put the country in a position to meet the situation promptly. In my humble judgment, we cannot afford to indulge in a "wait and see" policy. Others have indulged in that and they have perished.

Referring to the army and land forces, may I make these observations: Troops are what we need today, not merely thousands of men, not merely students taking a military course in colleges or in military schools, but troops, and troops as soon as we can get them. Time is of the essence. When I say troops, I mean soldiers, organized and trained in units—companies, battalions, regiments, brigades, divisions, officers, and men trained as units in teamwork and in coordination between the different branches of the service. Troops are the only things that count. Great numbers count next to nothing. How may we obtain troops at the earliest moment? As has been said so often, the regular army is the professional standing army element of our military establishment, and the Congress has authorized it to increase its numbers to 375,000 men. In addition to the regular army, the national guard called into federal service number 230,000 men. There will be a shrinkage in the guard shortly after they are mobilized, due to various causes, and the estimate is that after the shrinkage there will be in the neighborhood of 200,000 men.

The general staff, for years, to my knowledge—at least 18 or 20 years—has studied the problem of the defense of continental United States and the Monroe doctrine. As you all know, it is the duty of the general staff to make as close and exhaustive studies as are possible, in order to be able to advise the government and the Congress how best a certain military obligation may be carried out. It is not a secret in the war department that for all these years their first and most important consideration has been given to the defense of the Monroe doctrine. To my knowledge, for at least 15 years the general staff, which is composed of officers coming in and going out, not a permanent body in personnel, but a rotating body, has adhered to the conclusion that a land force of 1,200,000 men is necessary. It has been known all these years as the initial protective force. In it, of course, are included the garrisons in the Philippines, Hawaii, Panama, and more lately, in Puerto Rico. In it, of course, is included the entire overhead of the military system, which at times is heavy. That is the force deemed necessary throughout all these years for the proper and safe defense of the Monroe doctrine. I believe that we need that force, and need it just as soon as we can get it. I hesitate to let a day go by in delay.

The contention is that we can get it by voluntary enlistments. At the present rate of enlistment it would take nearly two years to do it. I do not believe we can afford to wait two years, or to wait one year. We cannot afford, in other words, to take any chances. We have got to be realists about this thing. It is no joking matter and it is not a pleasant thing. I wish to

heaven that the situation were such that the introduction of such a bill would be utterly unjustified. We would be a happier people. The world would be a happier world. But we are not masters of events, unfortunately perhaps, for the world at large. We are not the masters of events. Were we the masters we would have seen that things would have come along very differently in the last 8 or 10 years. The thing I plead for is that we shall so fashion our defenses that we shall be the masters of our own destiny.

Now, again, from the military side, if you will allow me, I want to discuss the workings of this thing, should the bill pass. It has been discussed in part by others, and I shall be guilty of repetition, I fear, to a certain extent; but, nevertheless, in order to attempt to put together a connected story I may have to be thus guilty.

Should this bill pass it is the announced plan of the war department to hold the first registration day about the middle of October. The blanks and notices and regulations are all ready. Of course, the draft boards, locally organized, must be appointed before that registration day. The first registration will be of men between 21 and 31, a pool containing 12,000,000 men. The first call to service is calculated to come about the 7th to 10th of November.

At that time it is estimated that the first call will use about 75,000 men. Between that time and we will say January 1, additional increments will be called in so that the number called in between the first part of November and January 1 shall in the aggregate amount to about 400,000. The 400,000 will be taken from the pool of 12,000,000—not a very heavy drain on the manpower.

They will not be sent to great training centers as was the case in the World War, but these men will be sent to and attached to existing units of the regular army and the national guard, which at that time will be in the federal service, and trained with those existing units, thus training class.

On April 1, 1941, it is planned for the war department to summon another 400,000 men and to assign most of them to the regulars and the guard. The total in the first year under the selective draft is to be in the neighborhood of 800,000 men in two segments, roughly, of 400,000 each. These added to the regular establishment and the guard—and the men are to be soldiers of the United States while they are in training—will by the end of the summer or the early autumn of 1941 actually produce the initial protective force of 1,200,000. That is the quickest it can be done. It will take a year.

From that point on the Congress is master. The Congress will be governed by world conditions. Tentatively the war department proposes that in October or November of 1941 another increase will be brought in through the draft, but the Congress will decide how many they shall be, for the bill provides, as most of you know, that no man shall be inducted into the service under the provisions of this bill unless the Congress shall have hereafter appropriated funds specifically for the purpose; and in no case under the provisions of this bill shall there be more than 1,000,000 men in

training in any one year. Should the Congress a year and a half or two years from now make up its mind that the initial protective force is not sufficient, then it will have to pass authorizing legislation to increase the number of men to be selected in a given year above 1,000,000. The Congress remains master of this entire situation. The legislation is to run for only five years. It is to meet this emergency.

I think that you will agree with me that in a country such as ours every man owes a duty to do his best to defend his country against attack. No one will deny that. If that is true, does not there go along with that another duty that he shall prepare himself in order that he may defend his country effectively? As I see it, there is the whole thing in a nutshell.

The boy who is able to go and whose departure will cause scarcely a ripple, considering the number, will go and, in my judgment, will serve his country proudly. I have never agreed with those who said the drafted soldier is inferior to the volunteer. Our experience in the World War with the drafted soldier was that he was a splendid soldier. I recall, for example, the 77th division, recruited by the draft from the heart of the city of New York and containing in its ranks thousands of young men of foreign parentage, young men of the first or second generation in America. You remember the story of Whittlesey's lost battalion. It was made up of the drafted men of the 77th division.

These men made good—excellent—soldiers. They saw their duty. They did not regard it as undemocratic. I never heard such a suggestion from any one of them. The overwhelming majority of the youth of America today stands ready. Youth wants to be told how and when, and youth will respond. That is all there is to it.

My heart has been in this thing since away back in 1920 when, as chairman of the committee on military affairs of the senate, I was instructed by that committee to report the National Defense act of 1920 and to include in it a provision for compulsory military training. That was 20 years ago. That provision was knocked out in the senate. The rest of the act was passed and is on the statute books. The provision was knocked out in the senate, and well do I remember the principal argument against it was: "Oh, well, there are not going to be any more wars."

YOUR CHILDREN MAY HAVE TO FACE MILITARY TRAINING

(An article by J. Edgar Hoover in Woman's Day, volume 3, pages 14-15, 60, September, 1940.)

One of these days Congress may order universal military training for the boys of this country. Any day, perhaps. Ten years ago that would not have been regarded as a likelihood. Then not enough of us had become realists. We believed that a sincere regard to avoid war could be a safeguard. We believed that the world had learned its painful lesson between 1914 and 1919. We looked forward to a period of prosperity and peace and content.

I wish to say to the mothers of America's boys that universal military training is not to be feared. It is in fact a vital safeguard of our future peace. It is one of the factors that will keep our country free, because it will prepare us for any eventuality.

There is no more peace-loving nation than the people of the United States. We have done our best to keep on terms of friendship with other nations. But we must face the facts. No matter how earnestly we endeavor to keep the peace we may be thrust into a war of self-defense. Not tomorrow. Not next year, perhaps. But at some time when we least expect it, when our guard is down and our defense loose and our national conscience free of any thought of aggression.

Because of that fact we must have adequate, widespread military training.

We can buy and pay for the airplanes and tanks and guns needed. But they would be useless without trained men. If we have the guns and tanks and planes *and* the men, the danger that we will be forced into war is reduced to a minimum. But more important, we would be able to defend ourselves.

In times like these we dare not be anything less than strong until the world has returned to sanity.

Precisely what is universal military training? Every mother will want to know.

First of all, it is fair. Every boy in the land is subject to it. Some will be exempt because of physical defects, or because they cannot be spared from their homes or their jobs in key industries. Not all of those subject to call may actually be summoned to camp. We have been a peace-loving nation in fact as well as word, and we lack the drill grounds and the cantonments and the instructors and the motor vehicles and the camp kitchens and the company cooks necessary to train and feed and blanket the millions of young men who are in theory subject to call. Even if the government had all the things it needs only a small part of these would be called at a time. The home life of the nation would be interfered with as little as possible.

Secondly, it is a good thing for the boys who receive it. I can speak of this from personal experience.

I was a member of one of the cadet companies of Central high school in Washington when I was in high school. One of the big days of my life

was when I became its captain. I know—I KNOW—what that training did for the boys in the company. I believe that so far as drill and discipline are concerned our company could be matched with any company of the regular army. We aimed at perfection. Boys who were weedy and slouching and stooped when they signed the rolls soon became erect and muscular and alert. They were literally made over. I have never been more proud of anything in my life than I was of my company the day we won the cherished trophy.

Thirdly, and this is something that every mother will want to know. Just what is military training?

The boy whose name has been selected will be directed to appear at a place named for transportation to the encampment where he will be trained. The selection of the men will be absolutely impersonal and impartial, for the army knows its business. As I have said, certain boys will be exempted for good reasons and only a comparative few will be called at a time. The moment he is enrolled as a trainee the army will provide everything. He will be assigned to a place in a clean, airy barracks. Mothers may not realize that in the army men become really good housekeepers. Dirt and trash are taboo under penalty. The lights will go out at the bugle call.

Your boy will likely be lonesome that first night, but not nearly so lonesome as you will be. He will be interested to the point of excitement. He will already have made some acquaintances, some of whom may become his friends. Everything he sees will be new. He may hear a dozen variants of our national tongue, from the clipped accents of the Yankee to the soft drawl of the Texas border. He will have enjoyed a full meal of well-cooked, simple food, for the army is specializing on the training of cooks nowadays. He may lie awake a little while to think things over, but he will not be worried or nervous. The next morning he will be shaken from his sound sleep between the army's blankets by a shrill noise he will not recognize at first. In the dawn light of the great room he will see his mates getting into their clothes. His training has actually begun.

Routine will be his part of the time. He will go through a thorough physical examination. Then his civilian clothes will be taken from him, sacked and warehoused, and he will receive his service clothes. Presently he will be assigned to a company which is a part of a new regiment, will be told how, when and where he will get his daily bath, the uninfringeable rule of the daily shave, he will wangle a call on the tailor to have the redundancy eliminated from his army pants, he will learn to line up when the "chow" call comes, and—

He will be having the time of his life.

He will work hard. There is nothing easy about physique building in the army. All over the high parade grounds awkward squads will be doing hay-foot, straw-foot drills until their members learn the snap and precision of the good soldier. I wish you could have seen my cadet company in Central high school drill as it once could drill. No doubt it was not perfect. There is no such thing as perfection, they say. But it was perfect in my eyes. Your son will be getting precisely what that cadet company got except in

a larger measure. Then your son will get a physical training that would cost plenty in a private gym. I'll be frank with you. He will be sore in every nerve and muscle for a time, but presently he will begin to feel the exquisite sensation of self-command. His physique will grow stronger and finer. Presently he will be tossing a rifle around as though it were a malacca cane, and be tremendously proud. You will hardly know him when he comes home.

That is the first part of military training. It is not the best part.

He will learn what discipline is—and like it.

It may come hard to him at first. One boy will understand the need for discipline and do his very best to obey as he should obey and handle himself as a good soldier, and his mate may be just the contrary. Yet fundamentally they may be exactly alike. Circumstances may have disciplined the one and missed the other. One boy's parents may have been unable to control him and the other boy's have required of him courtesy and obedience to order. It may be no one has been at fault and that no one has earned praise. But this I know—

An undisciplined boy will become an undisciplined man. Sorrow and trouble will be inevitable for him. Life is a hard disciplinarian and he may recognize this fact and bow to it, but if he does not learn it early in life he may be lost. The first step toward success in life is to learn to obey orders. To work in full accord with one's associates. Without discipline an army is only a mob. A disciplined army can do wonders. The boy learns by example and not only by precept that he, too, can do things he could not believe possible if he keeps on persevering as a good soldier should.

The key to success in life is discipline. I say this with all the emphasis in my power. When you and I were younger we were patriotic as a matter of course. Our parents, their friends, every one we knew loved the United States and cherished its institutions. But conditions have changed in the United States of today. There are those within our gates who do not understand what our freedom means, and vaunt foreign ways of life and destructive isms and ideologies. Others never do penetrate the easy secret of tolerance and universal kindness and think we are a soft and putty-like people. Some of them become gangsters and racketeers and their children and the children of their neighborhoods emulate them. That kind of rottenness spreads until corruption may foul an entire city. The only cure for it is discipline.

Again I say that it is not the fault of the boy. I do not say, as some have said, that "there are no bad boys—only unfortunate boys." But I do say that something is missing in the life of a good boy if he follows a friend into criminal ways. A father and mother cannot always be with their son. He would resent it and his mates would call him "sissy." It is worse than useless to cry over him when he makes one of the little errors that all boys sometimes make. Yet he must be guided and watched over.

Not only for boys who are "hard to manage" but for the good boys who have never given their mothers a moment's uneasiness, my suggestion is a period of training in a camp with other boys. It is the best possible school

for patriotism outside the home. For tolerance, too, and courage, and good temper and obedience to orders.

There is more to national defense than learning the manual of arms. National defense requires a rugged, stalwart determination of purpose backed with the means to carry on. The time has arrived when we must stop thinking of the ideologies advocated by the communists and bundsmen. They oppose all military training and preparedness alike. They are the modern obstructionists of a strong America able to hold her own before the onslaughts of every possible foe. A strong national defense necessitates a reserve force of American manhood that is physically fit, spiritually inspired, mentally trained and morally sound, and that is ready at a moment's notice. Widespread military training would provide this need—and more—it would constitute a medium for the perpetuation of democracy. Military training is an insurance of America's freedom and liberty.

To end upon a lighter note:

You will hardly know your boy when he comes home from camp. His training will make a man of him.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

(Statement of R. P. Patterson, Assistant Secretary of War, Released on August 5, 1940.)

Today, America needs an army of about 1,300,000 men. That sounds like a great many soldiers. In fact, it is but one for every one hundred of us. We need this force, not to wage aggressive war anywhere, not to send expeditionary forces to Europe, or to Asia, but simply to defend this continent against aggression. Let us see why.

In the first place, we are committed by the Monroe doctrine to maintain the integrity of the western hemisphere. Such a policy implies not only the defense of continental America, from Point Barrow to Tierra del Fuego, but also the denial to an enemy of air bases on any one of the numerous islands within flying radius of the mainland. Above all, it means the maintence of a Panama canal continuously open for the transit of the United States fleet.

For the successful accomplishment of these strategic missions, the war department believes that we must have as a minimum a powerful, mobile army, thoroughly trained and properly equipped, consisting of twenty-seven infantry divisions, two cavalry divisions, and four armored divisions, with the necessary supporting corps, army, and GHQ units. Based on our own previous peacetime standards, such an army is, indeed, a formidable array, but, compared to what other powers have at present, it is relatively a modest figure. Germany, for instance, has between 200 and 250 divisions. Great Britain has crowded into the United Kingdom alone, an area comparable to that of New England, a total of at least thirty-three divisions. With a similar number of mobile units, we hope to protect an entire continent.

In total strength this ground army calls for 850,000 men. To be sure, such a peacetime force would set a new precedent for America, but, in comparison, Germany has five to six million soldiers, while Great Britain has marshaled about one and one-quarter million to resist the nazi threat.

Since war has entered the third dimension, we must keep pace with air progress. War department plans call for 150,000 men to operate and maintain the necessary air corps equipment. Comparison with Germany and Great Britain again illustrates the reasonableness of the army's plans. The Third Reich boasts of a well-rounded air force of about one-half million men. The royal air force has about 250,000.

To these 850,000 ground and 150,000 air troops, we must add 100,000 for our overseas garrisons. These outposts in the Philippines and Hawaiian Islands, in Alaska, in Puerto Rico, and in the Panama canal zone provide security for naval and air bases from which our forces can operate to deny hostile access to our shores.

For fixed harbor defenses so necessary for the protection of seaports and naval bases in continental United States, the war department estimates a need for another 50,000 men. Nor does this number appear excessive when we consider the length of our coast line and the vital importance of our many large cities exposed to attack from the sea.

In addition, 150,000 to 200,000 men will be required for the induction and the initial training of recruits; for their supply, equipment, and medical care; and for other administrative functions connected with the establishment and maintenance of the augmented military forces.

The total in required military man power thus runs to about 1,300,000. All past and present experiences of the war department, both in peace and in war, indicate that such a number cannot be recruited on a voluntary basis. The only certain way of getting these men is to adopt a system of compulsory military training.

Since coming to Washington, I have heard the proposition advanced that the reason voluntary enlistments do not produce the necessary numbers is because the term of service, three years, is too long; and that a short term of one year would bring the desired results.

The war department does not believe that a system of one year voluntary enlistments would serve the purpose. Under such a method of recruiting, it would be impossible to provide orderly organization and training of military units on a time schedule. The number of enlistments would fluctuate from season to season, month to month, week to week, and even day to day. There would be a continuous flow of enlistments and discharges that would make impossible the semblance of smooth, efficient teamwork. It would necessitate a recruiting drive which might serve to win away from the bench and the lathe patriotic skilled workers who could serve best by staying on the job. Such an exodus from the factories might upset our whole program of industrial mobilization.

Voluntary enlistments are haphazard and catch men here and there by emotional appeals. The administration of universal service is orderly. It

places men where they can be of most service to their country. It imposes no onus upon those not selected for duty with the armed forces.

The principal objection to voluntary enlistment, however, is that it is undemocratic. In return for equal rights and equal privileges, a democracy demands of its citizens equal duties and equal sacrifices. The obligation to defend America falls with impartial justice upon every citizen.

Voluntary enlistment places the burden upon the patriotic few. Compulsory military training extends it to all. It is the democratic way.

A DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM OF DEFENSE

(An article by Freda Kirchwey in the Nation, volume 150, pages 723-724, June 15, 1940.)

A great and expanding defense program is being built in Washington. It has been forced on an unwilling country by the pressure of monstrous events. Our people have always and properly feared the effects of militarization. We have known that military might and democratic freedom are uneasy partners. In the past we have—almost without thinking about it—opposed a large standing army and compulsory service. We are a civilian nation, and we have taken our security for granted, putting trust in our great ocean barriers rather than in strength of arms.

Today this complacent confidence is gone. It is buried in the ruins of Dunkerque. America is arming. The defense program faces no opposition that counts. Four billion dollars looks like, and is, a small price to pay for protection against Hitler's plans of world dominion. It is only a small fraction of the amount we shall have to pay in cash and living standards and human values if Hitler crushes France and Britain. We are arming, and the only question is how much of our democratic freedom will be able to survive our preparations to defend it.

In the days when a big, but one-ocean, navy and a small army seemed an adequate defense, nobody worried much about the relationship between democracy and defense. Our army and navy are not democratic organizations; they are rigid hierarchies of rank, concentrating and exaggerating the social distinctions that exist in civil life. But each is a separate society, cut off as in no other country from the general community. And the whole armed force is so small and so scattered that its social influence is insignificant. No officer caste claims powers and privileges superior to those of the ordinary citizen. The organization of the army has been a matter of indifference to most civilian Americans.

That can no longer be the case. Our preparations for defense, both economic and military, will affect the life of every one of us. Methods that were harmless in a small military establishment will be intolerable when the navy is greatly increased and the army doubled. The shift toward a war economy has begun. And already the threats inherent in the new order are starting to materialize.

Some of them are discussed this week in the editorials that follow. As-

sured high profits for the makers of arms and planes and tanks; threats to labor standards and labor's rights to organize and bargain collectively—these are only hints of what is likely to follow in due course. In a series of editorial articles in this and later issues The Nation plans to take up the major problems that challenge those who want a genuinely democratic defense, who are determined that our national effort shall not be turned into a travesty of the institutions it is devised to protect.

The first requisite for a democratic program of defense is universal military training. This is a hard prescription for me to write, and it will be an unpalatable dose for many readers to swallow. Universal service, in the lexicon of liberals, has meant just one thing—state coercion of the individual. But new conditions demand the fresh examination of old dogmas. A small army could safely be a volunteer army. A large army must be based on the training and service of all citizens if it is to avoid military and class discrimination.

Already steps have been taken to dragoon the unemployed into the service. An amendment providing for "non-combatant military training" of members of the civilian conservation corps—some 500,000 young men a year—was attached to the new relief bill by a senate subcommittee on appropriations. Senator Byrnes has introduced a bill to train 1,000,000 men in "non-combat" subjects essential to the operations of the army and navy. This civilian corps would be recruited by the CCC and the NYA and trained by army and navy experts. Just the other day the state director of relief in New Jersey went to the shocking length of ordering that relief be withheld from single persons eligible for military service and that such persons be "required" to enlist.

This whole tendency is dangerous. Its logical result can only be an army recruited from the ranks of the unemployed under an officer class made up of West Point graduates and the product of the ROTC. No form of military organization could be more crudely undemocratic, more certain to encourage class distinctions and create discontent. By all means give military training, combatant as well as non-combatant, to young men in the CCC and to fit men on the relief rolls, but give it in equal doses to college students and employed workers and embryo stockbrokers. If training is properly planned to get the best possible results in improved physical stamina, in skill and self-reliance, as well as in military technique, it will benefit every young person in the country. The unemployed have surely no greater obligation to fight the nation's wars than other groups; a democratic defense system must call equally upon all citizens for service.

A movement for universal or selective training is growing, and its early sponsors, unfortunately though quite naturally, are mostly to be found among the conservative groups. But I shall be much surprised if the administration does not soon come out for it, and I am certain that the issue will crop up during the presidential campaign. I only hope that progressives will rally to the support of universal training in time to make their influence felt. That such a system is compatible with democracy has been proved in other countries, notably in Switzerland. That it can be an effec-

tive tool of tyranny was proved in Germany long before Hitler. It serves, in fact, as an accurate gauge of the democratic strength of the nation that adopts it. It will be up to American progressives to see to it that we build a citizens' army designed to contribute to a secure and free national life.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE

(Statement of Major General Amos A. Fries, U. S. Army, Retired, before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, Washington, D. C., July 11, 1940.)

I am very much interested in this subject, the subject of universal military service. In fact, I have preached that for 35 years. I am in favor of it and I believe it is the only method that will insure a republic continued life in these days of power politics.

This bill, I have favored in principle, in every sort of way, for many years, with the American Legion and others.

I think there should be real universal military service. I think that every young man of the age that is decided upon—whether it be 18, 19, 20, or 21—should be given a full year's military training. I think 8 months is not enough. He should be trained in the heat of summer; in the cold of winter; in the cold rains of spring and autumn, because this military training is first a training in citizenship, the duties of citizenship, as well as the rights of a citizen; and secondly, it is a training in health, because the military man must have health or else he is no good.

Third, then it becomes training in basic military and then in the specialized military.

I think every man should be willing and glad to give up a year. In fact, he is not giving up the year. He is getting training that will be worth more to him probably than any other year's schooling or training that he will get.

The selective draft is to meet this emergency. I have nothing to say against it. But I think the selective draft should not be considered as a permanent proposition. I think, as I have said before, that every young man coming of age who can walk without crutches and who has got brains enough to cross a street alone should take the training.

We need in the military, and we will need in war, people who are capable of doing a great many things other than shouldering a rifle or handling a machine gun as in war.

So that they should all take that training, and, of course, be divided into classes. Where a man does not have the physical ability for the full military, give him something else; but give that citizenship training; that health training; and the basic understanding of military.

Now, one other point I would like to touch on is this: I do not believe in making any exemptions for any purposes, whether it is conscientious objectors or not. I think a man should take the whole course in military training. I think he should take his full chances in war. If he does not want

to shoulder a gun, pull the trigger of a machine gun, all right; but he should go to the front the same as the others. He can drive a truck up there; he can drive a tank, he can work on roads; but he should take his chance in being killed as well as the other men. In fact, I think no man should be a citizen who is not willing to defend the country in time of war.

The Chairman. General, how about the provision for the dependents of men who are selected for service?

General Fries. Well, I think they should be taken care of, and that is one of the things I had in mind in saying that I did not believe in a selective draft, except to meet an emergency; that is, if you should go above the 21; if you take them at 22, after a few years you will have a sufficient army, but in the meantime I think they should be taken care of, and one of the troubles with a selective draft is that you might take a man earning up to $200, $250, or $300 a month. I think something should be done to take care of and see that his business is not ruined and that his family and other things are taken care of, because he is taken by chance out of a group where they are not all taken. I think you should take care of the man and his dependents under any kind of a selective draft system.

That is one of the reasons why I am for a universal military system that will take them all at the age of say 21, before they have gotten into a business or under other conditions.

I want to repeat, though, I believe it (a universal military system) is the only way in which the republic can be insured of national life in the future under these conditions, and it is entirely in accord with the liberties under a republic, because then every man takes the same obligation, undergoes the same training to defend his nation, and thereby assumes all of the obligations of citizenship which he should assume, if he claims the rights of citizenship.

IN ADVANCE OF THE NEED

(Editorial in Business Week, page 56, for June 15, 1940.)

So much attention has been devoted to the money and material sides of national defense that we have all but forgotten the third essential factor. That is, we had until the last week or ten days, when a few voices began to remind us that it still takes men to wage war.

Mechanized war naturally has focused our thoughts on industrial preparedness. As we are an industrially minded people, it comes easy to think of national defense in terms of airplanes, tanks, and guns. So we talk glibly about arms and equipment for a million men. That's fine; we should. But what million men?

We seem to be taking the men for granted. But we cannot take them for granted any more than we can take the planes for granted, or the tanks, or the guns. We cannot improvise modern soldiers of the land, sea, or the air any more than we can improvise their weapons. For they must be trained workmen, skilled in the trade of war. And on their skill may hang the

security of the nation—yes, even its survival. To staff modern equipment with unskilled men would be as criminal as to send trained men into battle without modern equipment. Either would be murder.

Let us see clearly that the mechanization of war has not replaced manpower. Rather has it underlined the necessity for more thorough and systematic training of manpower—in advance of the need. Once upon a time the farmer could leave his plow in the furrow, step into the kitchen and take his flint-lock from its pegs over the fireplace. And forthwith he was a soldier, ready to meet the alien regular, man to man. Soldiering was simple then. But not now.

Modern military training no longer is a matter of "spit and polish," squads east and west, drill in the manual of arms. It is a matter of fitting readily into army or navy life, of developing habits of order and discipline, of learning to coordinate effectively with others and to carry on under exacting pressure and harassing distraction. And above all, it is a matter of intensive training in specialized skills.

You cannot get such training on an army drill floor or in a few weeks of field exercises. It takes sustained, intensive application for at least six months or a year; it means buckling down to learn a new trade under conditions as nearly as practicable like those under which it must be practiced; it means periodic return to the ranks for shorter periods, to keep the old skills bright and to learn new ones as they may become necessary.

Neither should we leave to chance the identity of those who will make up our million men. That's neither fair nor intelligent. The number of men who can or will enlist in a professional regular army for a three-year hitch is very limited. We should not expect the members of the national guard to handicap themselves economically any more than they do now in order to carry the common burden. Moreover, we should guard against enlisting in the armed forces men whose services to the nation would be more valuable in industrial capacities. And after emergency does strike, it is utterly unfair to accept the volunteered sacrifice of the patriots for the benefit of the slackers, as it is utterly stupid to wait for the blow before we begin to train the men to meet it. The essence of preparedness is to be prepared.

All this means that our strength in manpower as well as machine-power must always be ready; that we must train our men to their jobs while they are yet young, keen to learn, and retentive of what they learn; that we must distribute the sacrifices of service equitably; that we must give our senior officers a continuing opportunity to command in the field forces approaching in strength those for which they would be responsible in war.

All this adds up to one total: universal military training in time of peace, and selective military service in time of war. No other program meets the test of modern war, no other can make the most effective use of American manpower, no other can effect so perfect a mobilization of American money-power, machine-power and manpower as to make our nation too dangerous for any aggressor, and thereby guarantee the peace that we are seeking in our present effort for national defense.

TO DEFEND AMERICA

(An Editorial in the New York Times for June 7, 1940.)

The time has come when, in the interest of self-protection, the American people should at once adopt a national system of universal compulsory military training. We say this as a newspaper which has never before believed in the wisdom of such a policy in time of peace. We say it because the logic of events drives us remorselessly to this conclusion.

The most powerful mechanized army that the world has ever seen is now striking at Paris. We must consider realistically the consequences of that army's defeat. If we are not to be caught without warning, we must face in all frankness the worst that can possibly happen. That worst is France defeated and knocked out of the war; England in no position to defend herself in 1940 owing to the loss of her supplies in Flanders; Hitler becoming the master of all Europe, either in possession of the British fleet or in possession of shipbuilding facilities which are many times greater than our own, in Germany, Norway, Belgium, Britain, Holland.

We hope that these things will not happen, but we are bound to recognize that the chance of their happening is great. We must recognize that Hitler has always shown an overvaulting ambition, great daring and an amazing sense of timing. We must recognize that he has declared himself the sworn enemy of the "pluto-democracies," of which we are the largest, the richest and the softest. We must recognize that his whole strategy has been to strike before his opponents were prepared. And we must admit that, except for a navy which we now want to put in two oceans simultaneously and which we cannot divide without weakening disastrously, we are in no position to resist such an attack as Hitler's air force and his armies are capable of making. A victorious Germany in close alliance with Japan, a victorious Germany in possession either of the British fleet or Europe's shipyards, would be an immediate threat to our security.

We have no possible alternative but to take advantage of such time as is given us to strengthen our defenses. Congress has taken the first necessary step by appropriating funds for the acquisition of material; but material is of no value without men who are trained to use it. We talk of our air defense of fifty thousand planes. Such a defense would require a ground force alone of at least half a million men. There are not half that many men in our entire regular army. We could not keep our planes in the air even if we abandoned every other measure of protection. The same Congress which has voted overwhelmingly for defense appropriations—unanimously in the senate, with a single dissenting vote in the house of representatives—is under a moral obligation to the American people to complete the task which it has started. With England's example before us, we cannot afford halfway measures or the luxury of hesitation. We should proceed at once to establish a genuinely democratic system of military service which will give us an adequate defense force and give the men who constitute that force adequate training.

We believe that such a system of service ought to be introduced as an

emergency measure, to be abandoned if and when the present danger has passed. We believe that it should be so drafted as to provide training not only for young men, but for older men as well. We believe that it should be accompanied by a well-considered but drastic kind of taxation, designed to prevent a single penny of excess profit from accruing to those manufacturers who fill our government's defense orders. This is a time for universal service.

If it be said that this is an election year, that politicians must be wary, and that Congress is not yet in a mood for straightforward action of this kind, let Congress go to the American people and let it ask them whether they are not ready to defend against all possible risks and all possible challengers the only way of life which they believe to be worth living.

DEMOCRATIC UNIVERSAL SERVICE

(Editorial in the New York Times for June 12, 1940.)

Several of the letters published on this page today argue that universal compulsory military training is "undemocratic." They say, as it was said in Great Britain before such training was adopted, that universal service is a "fascist" measure, that it tends to militarize a free people, and that it destroys the democratic way of life which it seeks to defend.

If these arguments are true, then Switzerland and Sweden are militaristic; Holland and Belgium, which resisted invasion, were "fascist"; Finland, which gave such inspiration to democracy last winter, is undemocratic, and France, now fighting so courageously for survival, is in truth an outpost of Prussianism. For all these democratic countries have known universal service for years. It has been a bulwark of their democracy.

In all the world there is no finer example of social and political democracy than Switzerland, yet all Swiss men are liable to military service from 20 to 48. The Swiss have not been brutalized by this system, nor have they lost any of their passionate sense of freedom in the process. They keep the rights and privileges of democracy, but they also know that those rights can only be kept by responsibility and service.

The cases of Sweden and Finland are similar. These are two countries whose social legislation, whose peaceful democratic achievements have won the admiration of free peoples everywhere. In Sweden military service is compulsory from 20 to 45. In Finland liability to service in peacetime begins at 17 and ends at 60. Without this training behind them the Finns could never have withstood the Russian invasion for so long, nor would their democracy be intact today.

Holland was probably the least militaristic of all countries before the war, yet the system of compulsory service was in force there too. All Dutch subjects of 18, and all foreign residents of the same age, were registered for military training, and were liable for service until they were 40. The Dutch system was less successful than in other countries, partly because there were exemptions for a wide variety of reasons, partly because only three-eights of the annual contingent were called to the colors and were chosen by lot. Yet

those who were summoned served for eleven to fifteen months, and they went cheerfully and willingly. Democratic Belgium had a stricter system, calling up all boys of 19 for twelve months of military service; the difference can, perhaps, be seen in the stubborn resistance of the Belgian army on the fields of Flanders.

The system of compulsory service in France has been the strictest of all. In peacetime every youth of 20 was called up annually for one year of active service with the army; thereafter he returned to civil life, but for three years held himself immediately available for a call to the colors. Next his name was included for sixteen years in the first line of reserves, and then for eight years in the second line. These are the men who are now defending their democracy, and all that they hold dear, against the onslaught of the tanks and the dive of bombers and the gray-clad hordes of the invader.

MILITARY TRAINING

(An article by Eugene Lyons in the American Mercury, volume 50, pages 360-361, July, 1940.)

In 1917 we swung from the extreme of voluntary enlistment to the extreme of a universal draft. We tried to train an army of millions in a few months and made a sad mess of the job. Raw, half-trained, bewildered boys were herded on transports and rushed into battle against seasoned fighters. Only a providential armistice saved hundreds of thousands of our amateur soldiers from slaughter in the unequal match. It requires no military specialist to recognize that one man trained at leisure is worth a score put through speeded-up preparation under pressure; and simple arithmetic provides the moral—that nineteen of the score thus prepared are condemned to death by lack of intelligent foresight. It's the difference between producing soldiers and corralling cannon fodder.

Yet we have done nothing to remedy the situation. Our four billion dollar defense program, undertaken with the almost unanimous approval of the country, is an admission that we accept large-scale war as at least an ultimate possibility. Under the circumstances it is a stupid blunder to wait until the fire starts to begin training the firemen.

The notion that there is something peculiarly "undemocratic" about systematic and universal military training was propagated in England because that country—until the present war—felt itself amply protected by its fleet. It flourished in the United States because we felt ourselves amply protected by two oceans. But intrinsically universal military training is no less democratic than universal elementary education or universal enforcement of basic hygienic rules. France was no less democratic by reason of its system of universal service than the British Isles with voluntary enlistments.

The United States must in the long run adopt some type of general military training. It is the inevitable corollary of the national security policy on which we have embarked. The sooner it is instituted, therefore, the better. At least a million men should be enrolled and trained immediately—and beyond that, a system of universal preparation of manpower should be quickly put into effect.

MILITARY TRAINING

(Editorial in the New York Times for July 10, 1940.)

The 240 educators, professional men and others who have signed a declaration against compulsory military training are ready to grant that "many" of the advocates of such a system at this time are "sincere." We may go further and grant unquestioned sincerity, patriotism and high purpose to the 240 signers of this declaration. We may grant that they are good Americans who are no less eager than are the advocates of military training to do what they believe to be in the best interests of the country.

The fundamental point on which we disagree thoroughly with them is the question of the reality of the present threat to the security of the United States. If we are in substantially no greater danger today than we were a year ago, then it may be admitted frankly that the case for compulsory training lacks strength. But how can it possibly be maintained that we are not today in a position of enormously greater danger than we were before the German drive began? Within three months the most powerful mechanized army the world has ever seen has rolled over Denmark, Norway, Belgium, the Netherlands, and France. Within that space of time Germany has taken possession (if Sweden too is counted as under Germany's influence) of more shipbuilding-ways for constructing seagoing vessels than we have in the United States. Within that space of time every opponent of the German system in western Europe except Britain has been beaten down. Britain herself is now about to be subjected to terrible attack. A large part of the British fleet may ultimately be destroyed. We ourselves have only a one-ocean fleet and an utterly inadequate air force. We have an angry and hostile Japan at our back. And we face, to the south of us, a number of reckless, discontented and unstable South American republics in which German influence has already acquired a foothold.

If that picture is real, it seems to us to be wholly unwarranted to argue —as these 240 signers do—that we can continue safely to rely on a volunteer system to provide sufficient personnel to man the mechanized defensive weapons we must have. It seems unreasonable to imply—as these signers do—that compulsory training is all right and democratic enough in time of war, but all wrong and undemocratic in time of "peace": is this really "peace" we are now enjoying, or is it a mere interlude before disaster? It seems sheer folly not to take every reasonable precaution that can be taken against a possible invasion of the American continents. And it seems strangely unreal to argue, as these protestants do, that compulsory military training would serve as "the opening wedge for the totalitarian dogma"—when it would so patently be used for the sole purpose of keeping that very dogma from our shores.

FOR MILITARY TRAINING

(Editorial in the New York Times for July 5, 1940.)

Six impressive witnesses appeared before a committee of the senate this week to give persuasive testimony in support of the immediate adoption of a system of selective compulsory military training and service. They included General Pershing, President Conant of Harvard, and Grenville Clark, a leading member of the New York bar, to whom this country is already deeply indebted for his gallant work in behalf of civil liberties and to whom it will find itself further indebted when it realizes how important and how valuable has been his work in behalf of adequate national defense.

The argument for compulsory military training, as presented by these senate witnesses, is straightforward and convincing. Every development in Europe's war shows the critical importance, for national defense, not only of modern mechanized equipment but of a personnel trained to cooperate and coordinate such equipment. This requisite personnel cannot be provided by the present system of voluntary enlistment. Army enlistment figures over a long period of years, and at this very moment, prove that to the hilt. The only possible alternative for a free democracy is a democratic system of selective compulsory training in which every American of proper age shares equally the responsibility of the defense of his country. The prompt establishment of such a system will help to unite this country in an hour of great danger. It will serve as "a clear signal to those powers from whom danger comes that we are alive to the realities of this new world of force and ready to meet them." As such a signal, it will serve as a preventive of war.

Every day that passes, every fresh warning of the possible triumph of aggressive dictatorship in Asia, every growing indication that the United States will indeed find itself in "isolation," without strong allies in a hostile world, argues for the adoption of a system of adequate defense training not at some vague future date, but at this session of Congress, now.

HOEY'S VIEWS

(An editorial in the Gastonia Daily Gazette for August 12, 1940.)

Governor Clyde R. Hoey of North Carolina has stated his views on selective compulsory military training in a telegram to the national emergency committee of the Military Training Camps Association.

The governor's message follows:

"I am definitely in favor of compulsory military training and believe that Congress should enact the measure providing for this training without delay. I do not endorse any specific provision of the pending bill because I am not sufficiently familiar with these, but I do endorse unequivocally compulsory military training and urge speedy action. North Carolina believes definitely in providing every means for national defense and wishes the work to go forward without too much governmental red tape delays. We need more guns, more airships, more tanks, more bombing and pursuit planes, and more men, and we want action in the letting of contracts and in the procuring of an army."

Governor Hoey's sentiments were expressed in a poll conducted by the national emergency committee. Preliminary returns show that only one governor in eighteen has declared direct opposition to compulsory training.

In a survey of editorials in the nation's daily newspapers, the committee has found that 90.5 per cent favor selective compulsory training, while the percentage for the mid-west dailies is almost as high—87.5 per cent.

F. D. R. AND CONSCRIPTION

(From "The Periscope" section of Newsweek, volume 16, page 7, September 2, 1940.)

When F. D. R. finally came out flatly for conscription at his press conference last week, he spoke directly and soberly, resorted to no evasion, and pulled no punches. What has been generally overlooked all along in the news of the conscription fight is the fact that F. D. R. throughout his career has been an advocate of universal military service—in time of peace as well as of war. During the World War, for example, he wrote: "Is it not time that the people of the United States should adopt definitely the principle of national government service by every man and woman at some time in their lives?" Again, in 1919, he said: "I hope that there will still be some kind of training or universal military service."

NEGATIVE REFERENCES

WHAT WE NEED FOR DEFENSE

(An article by Oswald Garrison Villard in Forum and Century, volume 103, pages 295-300, June, 1940.)

Ever since the beginning of the war, statements have been made—by officials in Washington, by some sections of the press, and by many speakers —to the effect that the European war compels the American people to re-examine their problem of national defense immediately.

That is emphatically not the case. There is nothing in the European situation to compel any hasty change of policy or attitude, unless we decide to enter the war, for each day the war improves the military status of the United States and weakens her potential enemies.

What is true is that the war has given opportunities to the perpetual boosters of ever larger armies and navies to increase their demands for more armaments. And these demands have been granted by the most subservient on Congresses, stimulated by the unthinking approval of a large majority of the American people (according to the Gallup poll)—a majority in no wise trained to consider American military and naval problems.

The war has not altered the strategic situation of this country. It does not decrease the size of those wonderful defenses of the United States, the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, which remain insuperable so far as any invasion is concerned. That another war has come in Europe has not changed the basic questions of defense policy, namely, whether we shall defend the coasts of the United States only, plus Hawaii and Panama; whether we shall ever again contemplate throwing large armed forces into Europe; or whether we shall defend all of North and South America, including Canada and our trade routes to the south.

While this war is causing an unusually rapid development of military aviation, there is again nothing in this situation to compel us to act hastily when others are doing the experimentation for us under actual war conditions. This is proved by the fact that we are letting the allies have six thousand of our newest airplanes. Nor was there ever any sound reason for President Roosevelt's increasing the enlisted strength of the army and navy at the outbreak of the war or even putting so many patrol ships into commission; having been in England at the time, I can testify to the astonishment in British military circles that any such move was considered necessary—except perhaps as a means of putting some hundred thousand more of our unemployed youth to work in the army, navy, and coast guard. Certainly the adding of these men to our existing military units would deter no enemy from an attack—were there an enemy and were there a nation capable of such an overseas venture as a descent on our coasts. But, now that Germany has taken over Denmark and (at this writing) conquered most of Norway, there will undoubtedly be a further demand for more men and more ships without pause to inquire whether they are really needed or how soon they can be ready.

The hasty increase of our forces last fall illustrates clearly the fundamental fallacy of much of our thinking on military and naval matters—that it is merely an increase in numbers of men and ships which spells added protection. For generations now, the Congress has voted ever-increasing sums for army and navy and has then gone home to assure its countrymen that they are safer than they have been because the fleet and the army have been enlarged. Nothing could be more fallacious.

If merely numbers counted, the Russian army must have won a great victory in the World War, since it outnumbered all others. What really counts is morale; efficiency; ability and technical training of officers, men, and, particularly, commanding generals. Here the historic example of the army of the Potomac, which was regularly defeated for two years because of its incompetent leadership and could probably have ended the Civil War at Gettysburg had General Meade merely ordered an attack after Pickett's defeat, is a classic illustration.

As it happens there is not a single official or board or bureau or committee of Congress charged with inspecting the results produced by the expenditure of the billions of dollars now being poured into the army and navy. On the contrary, there are the most startling charges brought against the efficiency of both services, not only in the public prints but by officers of high standing and by civilian experts—charges that would create a parliamentary sensation in any other country, that go unnoticed and unanswered in this country. We are building up enormous military and naval machines, augmenting the most dangerous lobby in Washington, establishing a military caste—all without the slightest assurance of efficiency and effectiveness in our armed forces.

Let us go further back, however. No national-defense plans can possibly be effective and efficient unless those charged with the management thereof are told what it is they are to defend. Unless the war department and the navy department know what their tasks are, they certainly cannot prepare adequately. They must know what their war duties will be. Here our Presidents have, as is the custom of politicians, taken different positions. Mr. Roosevelt, in fact, has taken several positions, without explaining their mutual contradictions.

For example, he on one occasion assured the Daughters of the Revolution that we should never defend anything but our coasts but at other times he has favored an enormous increase in our fleet, apparently for the purpose of making possible a war overseas. In articles published in 1923 and 1934, he stated positively that war with Japan is physically impossible, is out of the question. Yet lately he has been known to favor our having two huge fleets, one in each ocean; the one in the Pacific could only be conceived of, under present conditions, as a weapon against Japan. At other times he has favored the present strategy, calling for a single fleet transferable between the Atlantic and Pacific. He has never protested against the navy's advancing its defense line in the Pacific from Hawaii westward, even though it now seeks to fortify Guam, which is only 1,500 miles from Japan.

He has never told anyone why he departed from his earlier position that

war with Japan is altogether impossible—which belief, so he stated at the time, was owing to his having worked with the general board when assistant secretary of the navy. Here again there have been no strategic or geographical changes to account for the alteration of policies. The islands are just where they were; the Pacific ocean currents and fogs remain the same; the distances are unchanged. According to the recent head of the general board of the navy, Admiral Leahy, it is still utterly impossible for an American bombing squadron to fly from Guam to Japan, with a full load of bombs and war equipment, and return.

Here it must be noted not only that the President has not taken the country into his confidence as to what should be our military and naval policy in the Pacific but that the Congress itself has never voted on the issue—except indirectly, as when it struck out the appropriation for the fortification of Guam. The navy now says that it will be worth many battleships to the United States to fortify Guam and that, when the island is fortified, it will be entirely possible to defend the Philippines. One naturally wonders why, although we have owned Guam since 1898, this discovery was not made until just forty years after our annexation of that island. One's wonder grows when it is discovered that there is a split among both army and navy strategists as to the advisability of any such policy.

It is recalled that Admiral Sims—by far the ablest naval officer of our times—declared that all the money spent on fortifying Hawaii might just as well have been thrown into the Pacific ocean; that the Japanese fleet would never think of trying to reach America by way of Honolulu but would naturally take a route a thousand miles shorter, past the Aleutian islands in the direction of Puget sound. Admiral Sims even went so far as to say that, if war came, all that the American fleet could do would be to bombard the Japanese coast for ten days or two weeks, when it would be compelled to return because of the inability of any battleship to be out of touch with its base for any longer time. He was positive that the Japanese fleet would not even dispute the appearance of our fleet on its coast.

I have gone into these details in order to show how chaotic our thinking is on these defense problems. Actually our defense problems are profoundly affected by the personal views of the officers who for two or three years each happen to be at the head of navy and army. There, so rapid has been the militarization of the United States, they now completely overshadow and dominate the civilian officials who have heretofore always been charged with the formulation of national policy, in accordance with the historic Anglo-Saxon tradition. No one will disagree, I think, with the principle that, if it is proper and necessary for the safety of the United States to fortify Guam, the fact should be officially determined by the Congress and the head of the government and that the American people should be notified thereof, and the controlling reasons explained.

That brings us again to the fact that we cannot determine what is proper military policy until we know what political policies we are pursuing. Are we to commit ourselves to the probably impossible task of defending the Philippines or are we not? Are we going to seek to pursue in Asia a dominating

policy like that of the British government for so many years or are we not? There is some evidence of a deliberate desire in the state and navy departments to come to the rescue of the British by putting pressure on Japan when the British fleet is, because of the European war, unable to do so. Yet no one knows whether the American people would favor any such undertaking. We do know, through unquestionably accurate polls and through other evidence, that the American people are bitterly opposed to our present indirect participation in the war in China; but that opposition has nowise influenced the government to stop the traffic with Japan in goods which make possible Japan's continuance of her unholy war in China.

How can we then formulate and define foreign policy? That is the crux of the whole defense problem, and to that we cannot give a clear-cut answer for the simple reason that we have no continuing foreign policy and that the effort to establish one would be something new in our national life. Moreover, if such a policy should be voted by the Congress, there would undeniably be danger that a subsequent Congress, under the leadership of another President, might change the whole thing overnight.

Nonetheless, it does seem as if the Congress might at least decide whether we are or are not to defend South America and Canada—to what extent, for example, it approves the statement made by Mr. Roosevelt on his own responsibility that we should consider any attack on Canada a matter of profound moment to us. Congress could certainly clarify our policy in the Far East by stating whether we are or are not going to try to defend the Philippines against all comers. That would be only the simplest justice to the Filipinos and to ourselves, and it would give Japan to understand exactly what our plans are in her neighborhood. It must not be forgotten that the Japanese people believe that we are aggressively moving against them by our successive advances in the Pacific; that they have been told by their leaders that the fortification of Guam would be a direct menace to them (and we should feel precisely the same way if, let us say, a foreign power proceeded to fortify a Caribbean island).

Again, the question of the defense of our own shores could readily be settled by Congress. It could well voice the present determination of at least 90 per cent of the American people never again to send troops to Europe, an attitude which I believe has not been weakened but strengthened by what is happening abroad.

If the policy were openly adopted, the war department could then be ordered to abandon all its plans for raising an army of from one to three millions of men and could be held to preparing efficiently and economically for a strong mobile army to make a successful invasion of the United States impossible beyond all question. The relief to the national treasury would be enormous. There would then be no excuse for any failure to modernize and render efficient the machinery of the army. This move would make unnecessary the extension of military training throughout our universities and colleges and the maintenance of an enormous number of reserve officers (the number is now well over 110,000). It would automatically check the determined efforts now being made to subordinate the industrial life of the whole country to the supposititious needs of the country if she should go to war in

Europe or Asia. The defense of the coasts of the United States is as simple and easy a military problem as exists anywhere, because of that marvelous protection afforded by the three thousand miles of water to the east and the more than seven thousand miles of ocean between America and Japan. Definition of national policy in terms of such a defense would also clarify all the navy's problems.

Let us never forget that an enemy, successfully to invade the United States, must first defeat our fleet and avoid or dispose of all the submarines remaining after a fleet action. He must then successfully navigate our mine fields, during which time he would be subject to attack by the ten thousand army and navy fliers we are planning to commission. After having escaped or disposed of both our planes and our mines, the invader would have to conquer our coast defenses and, after conquering them, would have to face a mobile army of from four to six hundred thousand men—regulars and national guard. Merely to state the proposition is to show its impossibility (assuming adequacy of our preparedness), particularly if it is remembered that no such hostile expeditionary force could establish a base in the United States until it had safeguarded its communications by destroying our entire fleet.

It is of vital importance to bear in mind that, according to General Johnson Hagood, there are not more than *five* ports in the United States at which an enemy could find the harbor equipment necessary to disembark such an expedition—the huge artillery, the great combat tanks, the poison gas, the vast amounts of ammunition for artillery and infantry, the airplanes (which would be absolutely essential), the vast quantity of medical supplies, etc. In addition, Major George Fielding Eliot also points out that any invading forces would have to bring with them lighters, armored barges, movable piers, cranes, base equipment, reserve stores, and special landing devices. How fast could a fleet so laden move?

Yet the average American visualizes a landing on the beach—such as the federal army and fleet made at Fort Fisher in the last stages of the Civil War; such as General Shafter made on the Cuban beach during the war with Spain, on a couple of fine, tranquil days, without a hostile shot fired against him, he having only a few antiquated cannon to land. One should recall the fact that, in the World War, a whole harbor in the north of France and one in the south had to be turned over to the Americans, to handle our arriving army; that on not a single day did we ever land enough supplies to maintain our army on *that day alone*; that we never got a piece of American artillery to the front nor, during the entire war, any American planes except some of the so-called "flying coffins," which were used chiefly for scouting purposes. This conveys some idea of the gigantic character of any such undertaking.

We could not under any circumstances land a force of even a half-million men in Europe, with all their supplies and equipment and the necessary ammunition, if we had to rely solely on our own merchant marine; no less than 56 per cent of the 2,032,000 men we sent to France in the last war were carried by vessels of other countries, mostly by the British. It takes twelve tons of shipping to transport, equip, and supply a single soldier.

Just before I left London at the end of last November, I asked a British

general if he had ever heard of an officer in England or on the continent who believed that an invasion of the United States was feasible. This general, who was stationed four years in Washington and thoroughly knows the United States and the leading officers of our army, declared that it was preposterous even to think of such a thing. The same reply was made by all the continental officers to whom I put the question.

Nonetheless we are told by warmongers that we must lose not a moment in building a vast fleet, so as to be able to defeat the joint fleets of Russia, Germany, Italy, and Japan, plus the British and French ships which Hitler is to take over when he conquers Great Britain and France. I was amused at this statement of Admiral Stark's before the house naval affairs committee, because I prophesied several years ago that, if an earthquake were to engulf England, Japan, and France, our naval officers would immediately invent another combination of hostile nations in order to justify the continuance of enormous expenditures and the upkeep of a great navy, in order to terrify the American people and the Congress into voting a huge, quite unnecessarily huge, armada. Does Admiral Stark really believe that British and French navy men would ever surrender their ships, with the example of the Germans' mass scuttling at Scapa Flow before them? It is pleasant to note that our Admiral Taussig's declaration of war on Japan has been soundly rebuked by Senator Bennett C. Clark and many newspapermen. It is a pity that he was not also officially rebuked.

Nothing could be more unrealistic, to one who spent the first four months of the war in England, Holland, and Germany, than a statement like Admiral Stark's. The simple truth is what is going on abroad is a war to end civilization in Europe; and it will end that civilization whether it lasts, as the English predict, three years or, as some Germans say, ten years. I think that, if Admiral Stark had had the various talks with high financial authorities which it was my good fortune to have just before I left England, he would realize that no country can come out of this war, if it lasts even two years, save in such a state of exhaustion and financial liability as certainly to put into the far distant future the possibility of any further wars. The thought of an invasion of America by one or more of the present belligerents is even more preposterous when one considers the bitter enmities, now existing in Europe, which will not be wiped out but will be intensified, whichever side wins.

This is no time to take counsel of absurd, fantastic fears generated in vivid imaginations whose real objective is a world increasingly dominated by the American army and navy. This is the time to keep cool and calm and to be extremely grateful to the nations which are testing in the crucible of war new theories and new conditions which (so the Germans at least insist) render this war utterly unlike the last. We shall learn, if we are patient, whether the German militarists are correct in saying that they will prove before the year 1940 is over that the day of the battleship and cruiser is finished; that all that counts now is aviation. plus the submarine and the surface raider—that aviation which enabled them to put five thousand planes over Poland on the first day of the war and to attack at four hundred points there while destroying every one of the twenty-one aviation bases which sheltered the entire Polish air fleet. We have no time to contemplate the fact that so far in

this war British battleships appear to have been, under many circumstances, liabilities rather than assets. The role of the German air force in the Norwegian campaign would seem to make it even more sensible for us to await further developments before deciding that German claims are right or wrong concerning the supremacy of air power over other military arms.

Dreadful as is the spectacle of foreign nations destroying each other, we must realize that we are going to profit by it, profit by all the technical developments, by all the results of the unnumerable encounters. We have, for example, learned that three light cruisers are able to take the measure of a "pocket" battleship, the development of which caused great anxiety to naval theorists on both sides of the Atlantic. Let us conserve our money, control our fears, and lay down no more ships (our shipyards are so full, anyway, that no new authorizations can be laid down at present). The English would, I believe, be glad to exchange their battleships for more cruisers.

One more fundamental question remains to be discussed. The purpose of defense is to safeguard the American democracy which I, after a long life as a student of politics and international affairs, unhesitatingly believe to be, with all its faults, the finest system of government that men have yet devised. Its destruction would be the final blow to democracy and republican institutions the world over.

Now it is an undeniable truth that, when a country turns herself into an armed camp, makes the business of armaments on land and sea the supreme business of the nation, then there is created a national condition in which democracy withers and militarism flourishes. There is no greater fallacy than the American belief that the United States cannot be militarized. Nothing could be further from the truth. Already we have gone so far that civilian control of military policy is rapidly disappearing. The "nation in arms" tends toward aggresive imperialism and to fascism. I believe that, if war had not come and England and France had continued to carry on in the vast armament race, they would have regressed merely more slowly toward the fascism to which they are now moving, under the stress of war, with alarming speed.

The development of great armament industries creates a privileged class and deep-rooted vested interests which in every country can be relied on to drum up war scares and to fight against disarmament whenever there is danger that the great enterprises they have built up are likely to suffer because of that disarmament. If there is a Congressman in the United States in whose district there is a navy yard who will not vote more cruisers for that yard to build when the ways are empty, I do not know of him; in one district in New York the Congressman has to face delegations from ten thousand workers in the Brooklyn navy yard whenever there is an indication that the completion of the ships in hand threatens to leave the ways empty and to add the ten thousand to the ranks of the unemployed. From all the Krupps and Vickers-Armstrongs and Creusot-Schneiders there will come appeals to high heaven for redress, if disarmament should follow after this war—this despite the fact that every responsible statesman in Europe has declared that not a single country can continue to carry indefinitely the peacetime armament burdens as they were on January 1, 1939, even if this war should end quickly and

with no further piling up of war debts. In other words, one can pay far too high a price for armaments.

If fascism results from armaments, is it not of the utmost importance for a country not to pass the danger line? What will it avail us to arm to the utmost limit, to subordinate our national and industrial life to preparations for war, if thereby we lose our democratic soul—that soul we are supposed to preserve by pouring out armament expenditures without end?

David H. Popper of the foreign policy association and Professor Lindsay Rogers are two recent writers who have demanded the reinstatement of civilian control over the waxing military machine. Says Mr. Popper:

"In a world in which military supremacy and Spartan preparedness tend to become ends in themselves and the competitive hysteria of the arms race is all too apparent, the preservation of such control may ultimately prove essential for the soundness of American democracy."

If the war in Europe compels us to anything, it should be to a re-examination of our whole defense problem from a quiet, detached, and scientific point of view. It is gratifying, therefore, that already two bills have been prepared in the house of representatives calling for a civilian commission to investigate and report on the national defense; similar bills calling for a Congressional inquiry were introduced in the senate a year ago.

Congressman Paul W. Shafer of Michigan, a member of the house military affairs committee, who has recently made a nationwide inspection of army conditions, has prepared a measure calling for a commission, to be appointed by the President with the consent of the senate, to inquire into the question whether this nation is to prepare merely to defend her shores or to fight abroad; to put an end to wasteful, uncoordinated, and undirected military expenditures; to put a stop to the costly rivalry and lack of cooperation between the war and navy departments—to avoid duplication of activity, reduce expenditures, and formulate one harmonious defense program. Passage of this bill, appointment of a capable, unprejudiced commission, and achievement of the results Congressman Shafer desires would be worth infinitely more to the efficiency of our defenses than the voting of a dozen more battleships and an army of half a million men.

Finally, Americans must beware of having their fears exploited by those who have everything to gain by playing up the hostilities abroad as in some way directly menacing to us. The public should realize that the professional scarers enjoy the game; the more desperately they portray the defenselessness of the country, the more certain they are to win first pages, big headlines, and great appropriations.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING IN TIME OF PEACE

(Excerpts from remarks of Senator George W. Norris in the U. S. Senate, August 13, 1940.)

Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of presenting briefly what I believe to be objections to the proposed legislation (Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill) now pending, objections which make such legislation untenable unless we are radically to change the future history of our country.

I feel very deeply about this proposed legislation. There is one aspect of it, one objection to it, which so far as I know, has received but scant notice. To me that objection is the most serious of any, because I think it has direct bearing upon a fundamental principle which must prevail if our democracy is to be permanent. There are other objections to this bill, but which to me do not present the same logical cause for opposition to the measure as is presented when we think of the effect this proposed legislation will have upon the future of the country.

Compulsory military training in time of peace, Mr. President, as I see it, cannot long prevail in a democratic form of government without leading that government into the realm of dictatorship.

I desire first, Mr. President, to pay my respects to those who favor this bill. I do not question their fidelity, their patriotism, their ability, or their logic. We are living in times when all of us, whether or not we favor a large standing army, whether or not we favor a large navy, or a large air force, cannot be unmindful of world conditions. I confess that within the past two or three years, looking at the question, as I believe, fairly and honestly and conscientiously, I have been compelled to modify views on this question which I have held all during my mature life.

I take it that no one in the senate wants to engulf this country in the world catastrophe now going on in Europe. When I hear senators, as I have heard them in the senate, say they are in favor of compulsory military training in order to keep us out of war, having respect for their opinions, their judgment, and their honesty, I am compelled to admit, when I disagree with men of such ability, there may be some doubt as to my position, and yet to me it is as clear as the noonday sun.

I think the great objection to this legislation is the effect it will have on the history of our country in the years to come. It will bring about a radical change in the historic course we have taken since the birth of our nation. As I see it, Mr. President, that change, if it takes place, will inevitably lead us into a realm where we will have what we are complaining about in other nations—a dictatorship. I can see no escape from it. If we are to have compulsory military training in time of peace, we shall put ourselves on a level with the dictator nations of the world. To me, it seems perfectly clear, and it is with a feeling of hesitancy and of great regret that I take the floor now to give expression to my views on the question as they pertain to the effect of this bill upon our history as a government.

In my opposition to this legislation, Mr. President, I am not thinking so much of today as I am of tomorrow. I am thinking of the children who are still unborn and of the future mothers and fathers who are now the little

children of our nation if we establish compulsory military training in time of peace. I am thinking of the little child when he first opens his eyes and gets a view of his surroundings. I am thinking of the environment in which he will have to live. I am thinking of how it will affect all our descendants to be born in an atmosphere where the prevailing and most important thing connected with their lives is service in a conscripted army, devoting all or most of their lives to learning how to murder and to slay, even though it be called war.

I wish I could impress upon my fellow members and upon the people of the country what I think is the important thing we ought to consider. When a little child is born in a country controlled by an army, the chief end in view for every boy will be that some day he must attain a place in a military establishment where he can learn how to fight and how to murder. He will know no other atmosphere. He will live in no other atmosphere. He has come into a world dominated by militarism. He has come into a world where the ruler eventually will care more for training his people in the arts of warfare than for training them in the arts for peace.

It never has been that way in this country. We have lived in an environment of peace all our lives, except for an occasional war. We were not always warlike. We were not always learning how to kill our fellow men, against whom we had no grudge, against whom we had no enmity, and for whom we had a fellowship of kindness and of love. Yet, surrounded by a military force that engulfs everything else with it, the children of the future will come into a world where all those attributes will be absent, and they will not see them; they will not observe them. They will grow up in a country where the eventual ambition of every boy will be to see how far he can ascend on the military ladder. The finer sensibilities of human nature will be absent. The finer sensibilities of peace and love for one's fellow man will have disappeared. They will not be there. The child will not see them as he grows up. The predominating thing in the life of the nation and the individual will be to know how to fight and how to kill.

Will that affect human nature? I think it will. I think it will change it. It will revolutionize it. Mothers and fathers will grow up in this atmosphere, knowing nothing about the finer attributes of living in peace and harmony with their neighbors. They will think only of the exploits of generals, of battles in which millions of men are killed. They will think that is the great end of life. They will look with pride upon their little children, but will not undertake to guide their footsteps in any other direction. They will know of no other direction themselves. Everything will be military. They will learn to fight, and to die, if necessary, at the command of the ruler. That is the kind of a world into which compulsory military training brings us. The finer things of life are blotted out; they disappear. To my mind that is the greatest objection to the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I traveled in Germany at one time, the only time I have ever been in Europe. It was in a time of peace, many years ago. I had just entered upon my service in the house of representatives. There was not a war cloud in the sky. The world was at peace. With a small committee of the other house of Congress I went to Berlin. I went there a day or two before the

great national military maneuvers took place, and, with three or four of my colleagues, I was invited to see the maneuvers. The Kaiser, learning that members of the American Congress were there and desired to see the maneuvers, sent an official carriage for our accommodation. We drove into the country where one of the greatest armies I had ever seen was on parade. There was military marching, there was the artillery, there was the cavalry. It was a great day in Germany. Every German, from the little child just out of the cradle to the gray-haired man tottering to his approaching grave, was wildly enthusiastic about that day.

We saw the maneuvers. There was on our carriage some kind of mark. I myself did not see it, but there was some mark on the side of it, some designation, which indicated that it was a royal carriage, and when the little boy and girl in the street, the young man and the young woman, saw that carriage, although they did not know who was in it, they took off their hats, and saluted the carriage. It had a mark of royalty on it. It was a great thing for them to salute it. It gave them a thrill. It made them proud of their country. There was an emblem of royalty, there was an emblem of dictatorship, perhaps not larger than one's hand, on the side of the carriage, which said to them, "Here is something which in some way is related to divinity itself."

The army was greater than anything else in the country. Men and women of all classes were one in their attitude towards it, because they had grown up in that atmosphere. They never knew what it was to live in any other. Hence they were not to be blamed. Their attitude was perfectly natural. It was human nature. That was the greatest day of the year for all the citizens of that great empire.

The different provinces had their yearly military celebrations. I traveled in different sections of the empire. I would be awakened in the night by the sound of the tramp, tramp, tramp upon the streets, and when I rose from my bed in the early morning I saw men in uniform plodding along. I saw the cannon; I saw the cavalry at that early hour marching to some place where military maneuvers demanded their presence. The whole country was alive with the military spirit.

Mr. President, what effect did that have upon the people? That had been going on in that country for many years. No one lived there then that knew any other life. It was always the same. Their natures were changed, were perverted.

When an officer of the army happened to stroll along the sidewalk, with his sword dangling by his side, little children and grownup men and women would get off the sidewalk in order that he might pass. They had no feeling of resentment. They were proud to give way to the soldier. They were glad of the opportunity to get a glimpse of him as he passed.

I rode on a train through the country. It was in September. The fall crops were being gathered. I saw mostly women in the fields. I remember a hay field we passed one day. About a dozen women were on that little farm, some with rakes, some taking the hay up and putting it in piles by hand, some with pitchforks. There was one man, and he was driving the only team in

sight. He sat in the seat and drove the mowing machine. There was only one man, but there were a dozen or two women. I said to the man at my side, a German with whom I had been talking for some time, "Where are the men?" The answer came, "In the army." Yes, they were in the army.

Those women were proud of what they were doing. They had never known any other condition, and they were willing to toil in the sun and to do labor which we would do almost anything to prevent our women doing. They were willing to toil and sweat their lives away in order that their sons and their husbands might be supported in the army and learn to be soldiers.

There was no dissatisfaction. If we, too, had always that kind of an atmosphere surround us, there would be none here. If we were born and reared in such an atmosphere, we might never know of the happier things of life—of the dearer things. We might not know anything about the love and affection which the lowly Nazarene said we should bear to our brethren. That would all have been forgotten and cast aside. We would be military men. One-half the people would toil in misery and drudgery that the other half might be clothed in uniforms and learn how to handle muskets and other weapons.

Do we want that in our country? Is not that the difference between a dictatorship and a democracy? Do we want to convert our country into that kind of a place? It seems to me, although the thought may be bitter, that rather than put my country in that kind of condition I would rather see the end come and cross the river into eternity. If that is all that this life means, then life, indeed, as I see it, is a failure—and that is what is meant, senators. We may not believe it, but I think that in your hearts, when you consider it, you must realize that what I say is true.

What are the dictator nations? Who are they, prowling around, tramping upon innocent people? Someone said, "Think of Holland, think of Denmark, think of Czechoslovakia." The fate that has befallen them is the reason why, it is indicated, we should pass the pending measure. There may be something in that argument when applied to Europe, but there is absolutely nothing in it when applied here. If we were a small country, with a nation controlled by a dictator next to us, I can understand that we might feel our salvation depended upon arming ourselves to the teeth and training all our people so that they would know how to fight if war came. The argument for arming may apply to Europe, but the logic that applies to Europe does not apply altogether to America. If we were a nation in Europe, surrounded by dictator powers, I should feel differently. I think it can easily be shown that a condition such as exists in Europe does not exist on this side of the ocean, and, not only that, but that there is no danger of such a situation existing here, provided we do what we have already undertaken to do—increase our navy, increase our air force, and increase our standing army, as we have already provided for. We have passed legislation providing for practically doubling the standing army. We have given the President authority to call out the national guard. I would not have been willing to do that ten years ago, but Mr. President, I voted for that legislation now because I am not unmindful of world conditions, and I thought it was necessary for us to take the course we have taken.

But, Mr. President, is there no limit to all this? Is there no place on God's earth for men who want to be peaceful, who want to love their fellow men, who want to live in peace and harmony? Has the world gone so far astray that there is no nook or corner in it for any except those who want to fight and kill? If that be true, then the world is not worth saving. If that be true, and we are to live only to see how big an army and how strong a navy we can get for the purpose of killing innocent people, or even for the purpose of defending our shores from a war-mad world ruled by dictators, then life has lost all the attributes and all the adjuncts that make it happy and that make us love our homes, our fellow men, and our children.

Mr. President, when I was in Germany and looked over its fields and saw women working in them, I asked, "Where are the men?" If compulsory military training is adopted in the United States, and conscription becomes our national policy, 50 years from now travelers in our country will see women in the fields, will see women digging potatoes, putting up the hay, picking corn, threshing wheat, because the men will be in the army. I had rather not have a country, if that is the kind of country we must have. As I see the situation, however, there is no reason for our having such a country.

Hitler, perhaps the greatest dictator in the world, is, I believe, hated by more peace-loving people throughout the civilized world than any other man. Stalin rules great Russia. Mussolini rules Italy. Then there is also Japan. Those four nations are dictator nations. Every one of those dictators is dreaming of the time when his particular nation shall rule the world. This is a natural result of dictatorship.

Hitler dreams of that time, and so do many of his people. The same thing is true of Mussolini and the Italian people; it holds true with respect to Japan. Each dictator believes the country over which he rules occupies a superior place in history, is a superior product of the handiwork of God Almighty, and that his people are destined eventually to rule the world. That is what the Kaiser thought in his day. That is what Hitler thinks. That is what his people believe, and what the Kaiser's people believed, and it is perfectly natural that they should do so, because it is human nature.

When the finer sensibilities of life are blotted out, and nothing is left but a desire for guns and arms and the destruction of others, one of the things that buoys up people and builds up their hopes is the feeling that they are destined to rule the world. Hitler dreams of the time when he can do so. So it is with the three other dictators; they dream of the time when their country shall be all-powerful.

How can any one of them attain his ambition, and reach the position which he thinks his people should occupy unless he eliminates the other three? That, I believe will be the salvation of civilization. The one bright hope, it seems to me, is that these dictators, suspicious now of each other, enemies at heart right now, jealous of each other, will fight among themselves. They will have to. In his journey to the goal to control the world, each dictator will have to cross the path of another dictator seeking likewise to control the world, and when the course of elimination commences and they fight each other there will dawn a brighter day for democracy.

So far the dictators have taken one nation after another, adding them to their domains. That they may eventually come to us, I concede. I concede that they would like to conquer the United States. It goes without saying that every one of them would like to do that. But what must they do. Mr. President, before they can conquer us? They must first of all overcome our air force and our navy. With the large expanse of sea that must be crossed, who thinks for a moment that they could land a single soldier upon American soil, unless they had first destroyed our navy and our air force? Where are the transports now in all Europe that will bring their men across the ocean? If they know anything, they know enough not to start at the present time. To do so, it seems to me, would be perfectly foolish. I may be wrong in my judgment about that. Perhaps I ought to apologize to senators who do not agree with my position and who favor the bill when I make the statement that it is perfectly foolish to think that an enemy could land on our shores. I will modify the statement by saying that it seems to me it is foolish to think that such an attempt will be made.

WANTED: A PLAN FOR DEFENSE

(Excerpts from an article by Hanson W. Baldwin in Harper's Magazine, volume 181, pages 225-238, August, 1940. Copyright Hanson W. Baldwin. 1940.)

The public has rightly been impressed with the achievement of air power in the European war. But nothing that has occurred in that war has invalidated the basic concept of sea power. German sea power put the German forces of occupation into Norway and German air power kept them there. Yet probably no more than 150,000 German troops were ever in Norway; they were transported over sea and air routes only one hundred to three hundred miles long. Nor has British sea power, as such, been defeated by German air power. Germany almost controls the continent of Europe because of her land and air power; yet the British blockade still cuts her off from the rest of the world. The British navy put British troops into Norway and took them out again (with minor losses) when German air power forced their retreat. The British and French navies successfully evacuated 335,000 men from Dunkerque in the face of the most extensive air and land attacks ever known.

If so important in the scheme of Europe's war, sea power is therefore all the more important to us, separated as we are from potential enemies by 3,000 to 7,000 miles of ocean—ocean that can be dominated by ships alone.

The strength of our navy, therefore, is still of primary consequence. That strength today consists of about 446 ships totalling 1,746,000 tons, built and building. The extraordinary funds requested by the President will provide moneys to lay down during the 1941 fiscal year eighty-seven new vessels, which will increase our grand total to 2,212,070 tons. And, at writing, eighty-four fighting ships of 399,600 tons had been requested of Congress, bringing our potential total to 2,611,670 tons—by far the world's largest fleet.

Compare these figures with the naval statistics of our potential enemies. The combined sea power of all four states is somewhat superior to ours in

total tonnage, but in so small a ratio as to offer no danger to our security. This becomes all the more evident when one goes beyond the façade of statistics. For Russia is negligible as a sea power; her submarines could be, at worst, an irritant in the northern Pacific; it is extremely doubtful if her principal units are seaworthy enough to cross the oceans. Italy's fleet is composed of high-speed but short-range ships for Mediterranean service; some of Germany's ships have small cruising radii designed for duty in the North Sea; Japan's navy has been built primarily for service in the far east; our fleet is really the only blue water navy. Today the totalitarian powers could muster against us a tenuous and theoretical superiority only if their own waters were entirely stripped of all naval protection, and a weird conglomeration of ill-adjusted fighting ships sent 3,000 miles across the seas on a mission for which they were never designed and never intended. Even then, our own fleet, a tactical, unified whole, fighting in close proximity to its own bases, aided by shore-based aircraft, would have an insuperable advantage over a conglomeration of ships operating thousands of miles from bases and constantly subject to air and submarine attack.

But our fleet has certain weaknesses. Most of it is concentrated in the Pacific. The Atlantic squadron—which contrary to general belief, would *not* be a "pushover" for any power—is an integral part of the U. S. fleet, and is under the direct command of Admiral James Richardson, commander-in-chief of the U. S. fleet, who flies his flag in the Pacific. Naval forces in the Atlantic comprise three old but still serviceable battleships, with their thick deck and side armor but inferior range and slow speed; an old battleship converted into a training ship which might be made into a fighting unit; an aircraft carrier, five swift, modern cruisers (plus others temporarily on this coast), more than a match for any ships of their type in the world; and a torpedo fleet of very considerable strength and mobility consisting of forty destroyers and twenty or more submarines, and a growing "mosquito" squadron of motor torpedo boats—all backed up by the navy's long-range patrol bombers. These Atlantic forces should be strengthened by two or three more battleships, another aircraft carrier, and some more cruisers, and will undoubtedly be so strengthened when ships of these types now building are completed.

The German air force is a separate force—organized, trained, and equipped under a ministry separate and distinct from the army and navy ministries. So is the French air force; so is the British. But it is obvious that the German air force has developed the use of air power to a far higher degree than either the British or French. We do not have a separate air force; our army and our navy control their own air forces. It ought to be evident from the lessons of the war that the type of organization doesn't matter. What does matter is the coordination between surface and air units—so marked in the case of Germany, so lacking in the case of Britain and of France.

The outstanding air lesson of the war is that air power is most effective when used in close and intensive support of naval units and ground troops—in cooperative action. Acting independently on long-range missions, it has sometimes achieved successes, but its record has been at best spotty and its

success has been almost directly proportionate to the distance of the targets attacked from the home bases and to the number of planes used in the missions.

Applying these lessons to our problems we find, therefore, need for planes designed, organized, and trained to cooperate in close support of army and navy and a need for powerful, long-ranging bombers capable of carrying our strategical missions in considerable mass at considerable distance from base. Our strategical problem, as has been pointed out, involves distance and bases. Given the bases—and we must have them—we then require planes. of long enough range (longer than the range of any enemy planes—and this is a challenge to our technicians!) to cover all overseas approaches to those bases and to guard all vital areas of the hemisphere. But the training and operations of these long-range bombers should be closely integrated with the operations of our fleet, for the first line of defense of the western hemisphere is primarily a water line.

The navy's long-range patrol bombers—great flying boats which can carry several tons of bombs and some of which have radii of 1,000 to 1,800 miles—are ideally suited for this job. But we have not enough of them. The army's Boeing "flying fortresses," faster than the patrol planes but with less range—are also well-equipped for this work.

For close cooperation with the fighting fleet and the battle line are the scout-bombers, fighters, and torpedo planes of the aircraft carriers, and the catapulted seaplanes of the cruisers and battleships. We shall require from 75 to 100 more of the former types for each new carrier we put into commission; from two to six of the latter for each battleship and cruiser. We now have by far the largest ship-based air force in the world; there is no necessity for any great increment of this strength, merely the addition of sufficient new planes to provide air equipment for the new ships we build.

The army, however, has no such closely integrated and well-knit air forces to support its ground forces. Observation planes are the only type closely attached to the individual ground units. The army has no dive bombers; the air corps virtually gave up the attack plane—a type which it first developed and perfected—some time ago because some of our pilots were so bemused with the vision of an independent air arm winning wars by itself that we neglected the proper development of types to cooperate with ground troops. Dive-bombers (like the famous German "stukas"), attack planes, and medium bombardment and pursuit types should be developed and merged into an instrument devoted to one end—support of the ground forces.

Here, then, is our problem defined. How many planes do we need? An exact definition of our needs must depend upon an exact location of the bases available to us, but it can be said with some confidence that we do not need and should not attempt to maintain an air force of 50,000 planes. Indeed, the actual requests of the fighting services seem to be somewhat more realistic, and it is likely that the goal of 50,000 planes mentioned by the President in his defense message must have been intended to convey his conviction that our air forces should be greatly strengthened, rather than to set any such figure. The navy has asked for 10,000 planes, 16,000 pilots; the army's exact requests at writing have not been finally determined, but apparently will be

about 11,000 planes. Unless a considerable proportion of these planes are to be training planes or held in reserve (as now seems likely) these figures appear excessive, for we have nothing to fear in the air from Japan, who is a weak air power, and even Germany, the world's greatest air power, probably does not maintain in active operating combat squadrons more than 4,500 to 8,000 planes, and only a handful of these would have range enough to cross even the southern Atlantic—from French west Africa to the hump of Brazil.

The army is this nation's and this hemisphere's third line of defense. It is an important element of that defense (we should not make the mistake of thinking that wars can be won by seapower and airpower alone), and some of its functions are particularly vital. In the past we have been committed to the principle of a small citizens' army rather than the maintenance of a huge standing army which can be utilized effectively not in this hemisphere, but only on European or Asiatic battlefields, where the borders of hostile nations crowd across the map and mass is still hurled against mass. The mass armies of Europe or Asia cannot easily be transported to this hemisphere—can never be so transported provided we retain control of the seas and maintain a proper air defense. A small army could be transported—the maximum initial force that could be transported even if control of the sea were wrested from us—would not be much larger than 50,000 men. The transportation of such a force would require 375,000 tons of shipping, perhaps 40 ships, about the largest force that could conveniently be convoyed in a single operation. To supply such a force might require from 650,000 tons of shipping to 2,000,000 tons monthly; in other words, perhaps half the tonnage of the German merchant marine would have to be devoted solely to the job of supplying 50,000 soldiers. If this force were to be doubled, the shipping tonnage necessary would be doubled; to supply an army of 1,000,000 men in this hemisphere would require at the very least 13,000,000 tons of shipping. Economically and commercially the problem seems impossible; not even Britain, or a combination of Britain and Germany, has sufficient shipping to divert such an enormous amount of it from their ordinary and vital trade routes to military purposes.

We do not, therefore, have to fear the employment of mass armies in this hemisphere; the most we have to guard against is the possible transportation of a small expeditionary force.

There are now pending various proposals for the increase in size of our army—some of them involve relatively small but necessary numerical increases, others a basic change in the whole fundamental structure of our defense forces, a basic change indeed in the concept of our democracy. In the latter category falls the suggestion, now vigorously pressed, for conscription. Conscription in time of war can be justified. But at a time like the present it cannot be justified *on a basis of hemisphere defense*, for no such mass of men as conscription would provide can effectively be used in this hemisphere —with one possible exception: if we were preparing for a death struggle with a Japanized Asia and with a completely Germanized Europe in which all the navies and merchant marines and shipbuilding facilities of the continent were in German hands—a possibility which we have previously discussed and considered to be most unlikely.

Events do not warrant the painting of the international picture in such black overtones as this. But whether or not conscription is genuinely needed, it should never be endorsed except after careful consideration and with an understanding of the basic change in our lives and our customs that it will entail. Invocation of a compulsory service act has many arguments in its favor, but it should be clearly understood that its adoption would create a profound, lasting, and inescapable change in the economic, social, and political life of our country and might well retard the growth of our civilization. A measure of such consequence if enacted in time of peace may become a permanent part of our institutions; it should not, therefore, be considered by Congress in this era of hysteria, but, if intended as a permanent measure, only in a time of calm calculation. On the other hand, if conscription is needed merely as a temporary emergency measure to last for the duration of the emergency, then the emergency ought to be defined; if the international picture is black enough to warrant conscription then the President should declare a state of national emergency or Congress should declare a state of war.

And if the army can fill its minimum needs in men without conscription there are still some valid arguments for it—but the most important, the need for manpower, falls by the wayside. And we have not yet even had a chance to try to fill our requirements by voluntary recruiting.

What are those requirements? The functions and responsibilities of our land forces are several. First, our regular army must provide garrisons and defenses for army, navy, and air bases now established. This may require eventually 125,000 to 150,000 men, with the most heavily guarded points the Panama canal, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and several points in the Alaskan-Aleutian area. Second: the regular army must provide the nucleus or cadre for coast defense and anti-aircraft troops to make our continental base within the United States secure; it must have eight to fifteen men per plane to operate its air force; it must provide officers and instructors to train the national guard and to form the skeletal structure upon which a large mass army may be built up in case of necessity after "M-day." And, under our broadened responsibilities of hemisphere defense, it has another function of recent development. It must provide a field force, highly trained, fully equipped, instantly ready for transportation as an expeditionary force anywhere within the western hemisphere—to quell, with the help of the navy and air force, alien-inspired revolutions, to seize an advanced base, to repel an attack or hold an area, until larger forces are transported, if necessary, to assist it. Such a force certainly need be no larger than 150,000 men—perhaps half that number—about the number with which Germany, only one hundred miles away, seized Norway. Adding to this the numbers required for the army's other functions, the regular army, even to fulfill its broadened responsibilities, need be no larger than 400,000 men, if that large. Our present enlisted strength is about 280,000; a further increase is indicated, but it should not be hard to fill the necessary quota by voluntary recruiting.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE

(Editorial in the New Republic, volume 103, pages 6-7, July 1, 1940.)

It is acknowledged by almost everybody that the only efficient way to raise a great army for modern war is by compulsory universal service. Every nation confronted with this task has used this means, whether the government concerned be autocratic, democratic, or somewhere between. Even Britain and her chief dominions, with the exception of Canada, have installed conscription before or during the present war, although the British tradition places a higher value on individual liberty than any other in the modern world. (Canada is a special case, because of her French Canadian population, whose loyalty either to the empire or to republican France is dubious, to say the least.) The primary reason for universal service, whatever else may be said for it, is dire necessity. The ultimate test of victory is manpower; nothing less than the military effort of a whole population will suffice. Campaigns for volunteers are too slow and uncertain in recruiting the necessary numbers.

Volunteering suffers two additional disadvantages which alone would be enough to send it into the discard. First, an army must receive long and intensive training before it is called upon to fight efficiently in the modern manner, and it is impossible to stir up enough interest in a recruiting campaign while a nation is still at peace, though that is the time when the training should be given. Second, there is much more in proper war organization than getting the necessary number of men under arms. It is getting the right men in the right places, and refraining from putting uniforms on the men who would be more valuable in the equally important functions of industry and transport behind the lines. In order to mobilize a nation it is necessary to put through the sieve the whole generation of fighting age, so that there may be sifted into separate compartments those who ought to stick at their jobs, those who are unfit for service, and those who are better fitted for special duties than for the front line. Universal service is the only possible means of putting system and order into a military machine of ambitious size.

Just as the New Republic endorsed universal service during the last war, it would unhesitatingly advocate universal military training in the present effort of building up the national defense, the moment it became clear that a large army might be needed. It would do so first of all for the reasons of military necessity explained above, since if a democracy must fight, it is folly for a democracy not to put every ounce of its strength into the struggle.

But there are additional reasons of a political nature, which seem to us compelling. First is danger to free institutions of a large professional standing army. The way to safeguard liberty against the worst abuses of militarism, if one must go in for militarization, is by way of a citizen army. Civilians temporarily in uniform cannot be treated as the minions of an officer caste, provided the civilians are at the same time citizens of a democracy. Since they include all shades of persuasion and all groups in the community, it is hard to weld them into a political movement serving minority interests. And, if worst comes to worst, democracy is safer when everyone knows how to shoot than when only a professional minority knows.

Still another good reason is that the sense of solidarity and equality of sacrifice which a nation in peril requires is furthered by the knowledge that in the matter of military responsibility all are equal. Finally, the fact that individual citizens are being conscripted to fight makes it easier to enforce on industry and property the rationalization, the restrictions of price and profit and the high taxation which are indispensable. Indeed, universal service stiffens the pressure on everyone behind the lines and makes war profiteering such a source of moral weakness as to compel the most strenuous measures against it. If universal service were in force, any candidate who proposed to fight a war with good old "business as usual" would be more unpopular than a fifth columnist.

The question now before the United States, however, is a peculiarly difficult one, because it is still a question how large an army we shall want and how soon we ought to try to get it in shape. If what we need is what is at present authorized—a highly skilled and mechanized force of something less than a half-million men, it is not too large to be raised by ordinary recruiting methods from our great population, and it is scarcely large enough to be a danger to our institutions. To put every young man through intensive military training when we expect to utilize only four or five per cent of those between twenty and twenty-four (who number above 10,000,000) would be excessively wasteful. Even an army of a million or a million and a half would scarcely seem to warrant universal training, though it might justify selecting those for training through the method of universal registration. And no widest estimate holds that we shall need a force larger than this, or could equip it soon if we did—unless, indeed, we are preparing to challenge Hitler on the other side of the Atlantic and the Mikado on the Yangtse.

A second consideration is that for the moment our front line is being held by Great Britain. It would be poor economy indeed to take from that line such pitifully inadequate munitions and supplies as we are now able to send it in order to begin training and equipping an army that could not possibly get into action for two years, or one that is larger than we are likely to have to employ. It is well known that when we entered the last war and began to form a big army, the allies received almost no arms from us for the duration of the war, but on the contrary had to supply a large part of the weapons for those of our soldiers who saw action. Until those now engaged against Hitler need men more than munitions, it is the worst of strategy to devote our still unmobilized industry to anything but the supply of weapons for them. Already our army authorities have severely hampered "aid short of war" by emphasis on purely nationalistic defense, need for which is not likely to arise if Britain is not defeated. We should be ready to move quickly to training as soon as strategic economy permits, but not too soon. It is a matter of timing, and of the speed of industrial mobilization, and of the capacity of the British to hold firm.

With these considerations in mind, it seems to us that the Burke bill for universal training now in Congress is illy adapted to the situation. It is almost a carbon copy of the measure used in the last war; it is unnecessary for anything except for the task of raising and training a military force of millions; it contains no hint that its authors have anything like a realistic view of the present world or of the needs of this country.

Though no administration measure has been presented as we write, we like much better the hints thrown out by the President as to the sort of thing he would favor. It would apply, not to the whole population, but to young men only—and possibly young women as well. It would recognize that only a small part of those registered would be required for strictly military service. It would provide useful things for the others to do—and our relatively small experience with the CCC and the WPA shows that there is plenty of non-military work which must be done if the nation is to become sound and strong. It would explicitly be administered in view of the fact that one of the main functions of an institution of this kind is to nurture the interest of democracy in common service of the community. And it would express the truth that a large part of our job is not just to teach men to fight, but to teach them to work together for all tasks required by a democratic state, whether destructive or constructive.

NO NEED TO RUSH

(An article in the Kansas City Star for June 25, 1940, by the Star's military commentator.)

Much talk is heard about universal military service or other forms of national training for war in the United States. Various bills have already been introduced in Congress to provide compulsory military training of one kind or another.

Why all the haste?

Plans to put into effect a selective draft system have been drawn up by competent army officers and are on file in the war department. They are presumed to fit in with the provisions of the National Defense act, adopted by Congress in 1916 and amended in 1920 on the basis of experience in the last war.

It would not be difficult to bring these plans up to date in any emergency. Before anything is done, however, Congress, the administration and the country should consider carefully an answer to this question:

What kind of a war are we going to prepare for and where are we going to fight it?

The study of military policy in connection with international policy brings up several important considerations. If the purpose of the United States is not to intervene in Europe in behalf of the democracies then the need for vastly organized manpower is not at all urgent. If we are going to intervene overseas, the question of where we are going to fight becomes puzzling. It is too late to save France now and helping Great Britain immediately presents an acute naval problem, not one of military aid.

Any effort to save the democracies by means of manpower mobilization and the tremendous expeditionary effort entailed would mean, perhaps, that American troops would have to fight in Palestine and northern Africa. Such an eventuality, in the first place, appears so difficult from the standpoint of overseas communications and supply as to be almost impossible. In the sec-

ond place, there is every reason to believe the American people would be cold to the idea.

Sending an expeditionary force to the British Isles is feasible, of course. But will it be needed? Here the question of time element is important. If the combined efforts of the British navy and its ground and air forces, concentrated in the compact area of the islands, cannot hold off the German blitzkreig in the next few weeks or months—whatever time is required to assemble and transport an American force trained and equipped and of sufficient size to turn the tide of war—it will be too late anyway.

Under a policy of all-around defense of the Americas, the question of required manpower is different. No huge army will be needed. Rather, it calls for a great air force, equal to any combination that could be used against it; a navy of similar capability and a small, highly mobile and completely equipped field army which could be transported quickly to any point of danger in the western hemisphere.

No direct attack on the United States proper is conceivable in the near future. Developments in the present war, and in particular the break-up of the British empire, will provide the warning signals in ample time to undertake universal mobilization and training of our manpower. The rifles, machine guns, artillery, tanks, and airplanes for a great national army cannot be manufactured in a few weeks. In fact, with all resources devoted to it, the equipment would not be available for a year or more.

As matters stand at present the building up and training of an American army, based on the voluntary enlistment system, is making satisfactory progress. It should not be impossible to increase the regular army to 400,000 in this manner. This force, combined with a national guard of 250,000 and 100,000 reserve officers, is large enough to provide "initial protective force" out of which a possible expeditionary army of not more than 250,000 would be available for dispatch rapidly on any mission of hemisphere defense.

Expansion of the army on present lines calls for a greater use of reserve officers and in this respect the United States is far better off than it was at the beginning of the last war. This has been made possible through the Reserve Officers Training Corps in schools and colleges. This month, for instance, 9,099 young men are being graduated from the 4-year training course, qualifying them for commissions as second lieutenants in the reserve. The total number of reserve officers now available is 103,000. Only a few, mostly in the higher grades, are veterans of the World War. In 1917, there were a mere 2,700 reserve officers.

This provision for army leadership in time of war has been one of the least costly of all national defense items. The annual appropriation has been only 11½ million dollars. Of this 5 million has gone into uniforms, equipment and general expense of operation, and the remainder for pay of officers and non-commissioned officers assigned as instructors. In the last year, 116,309 youths in colleges and advanced military schools received instruction, the majority taking the basic 2-year course under the compulsory training provisions in existence in certain land grant schools.

Sometimes called the largest military school in the world, Texas A. and

M. college had 5,701 cadets taking training during the year. Ohio State was second and Illinois University third. An increase of 20 per cent in the number trained in both colleges and high schools was noted in the last two years. Many schools are clamoring for R. O. T. C. units, but the war department is opposed to further extension on the ground it would cause too great a dispersion of equipment and personnel for instructional purposes.

Up to now the voluntary system of creating a military force appears to be equal in development to the rate of equipment. If anything further is needed, it would come from some nationwide, but still voluntary, method of mass physical training, under which the manhood of the country could be made fit to meet future demands.

All that has been said here is purely a consideration of manpower and its relation to U. S. military policy. There should be no relaxation at any time in the mobilization of all technical and mechanical resources, including the schooling of men in the necessary trades, to provide every weapon and piece of equipment that our defense program demands.

NO CONSCRIPTION!

(Editorial in the Christian Century, volume 57, pages 894-895, July 17, 1940.)

One of the first results of the war scare which has gripped the nation ever since Hitler launched his drive across western Europe has been a demand for conscription, usually referred to by its proponents under the euphemistic title of universal military service. Sometimes the names implied are even milder in sound, and proportionately deceptive in actuality. Conscription is conscription, no matter what fancy names may be used to cover over the reality. It is an effort to put the entire nation in arms, and it is just as dangerous to human freedom and the right of individual conscience when employed by a democratic state as when it is used by a totalitarian dictator.

The United States has resorted to conscription under pressure of war on two occasions. There was conscription on both sides during the Civil War, and on both sides it was a conscription which discriminated against the poor in favor of the rich or of those with political influence. There was a much more equitable form of conscription in force during the World War. But never has this nation consented to introduce such a militarizing system during time of peace, although there was an unsuccessful attempt of that sort made while Attorney General Palmer was stirring up his "red hunt" hysteria soon after the World War. Today, however, the drive has been resumed, and it has powerful forces behind it.

The conscription scheme now before Congress is contained in S. 4164, on which the senate military affairs committee is holding public hearings. It is sponsored by Senator Burke of Nebraska, who leaves Congress next January, and Representative Wadsworth of New York. It has the official approval of the war department and of the Military Camps Association, one of those mysterious and well financed letterhead organizations which spring to the aid of official agencies when there is a propaganda job to be done. It provides for the compulsory registration of all men from 18 to 65 years of age,

liability to military service for all between the ages of 21 and 45, and pay of $5 a month, which the war department has magnanimously announced should be raised to $21. There is vague talk to the effect that the first contingent to go into training would number about 2,000,000 men, selected by lot, and that men above and below the age limit for active service might be trained for "home defense."

This, it will at once be apparent, is a scheme to raise an army three times as large as any that the army itself has declared would be needed for the defense of this country. That there is more than an expectation of foreign adventure in the background is suggested by another section of the carefully phrased war department press release which describes the total scheme. It points out that the navy is expected to fit out ships to be kept continually loaded with tanks, artillery and planes, thus providing swift transportation and equipment for armored divisions to be sent abroad. Such divisions, it is said, are to be ready at a moment's notice "like a fire engine" and are to be stationed in the Caribbean "within easy striking distance of Latin America." From that base they might just as easily be dispatched to Europe, or through the Panama canal to Asia. But nothing is said about that.

Among the sponsors for this conscription program are the presidents of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, together with lesser luminaries of the educational world; General Pershing and other military men, the new secretary of war, Henry L. Stimson; any number of important figures in the eastern financial world and, last but by no means least, the general manager of the New York Times, Colonel Julius Ochs Adler, who has made that influential paper the bellwether of the whole conscription flock. It is no coincidence that the noise of all this martial trumpeting comes from that part of the country where both the manufacture of munitions and international finance which has so large a stake in the British empire have their centers.

In spite of high-pressure propaganda, the case against conscription is as clear today as when Daniel Webster in 1812 brought about its defeat in spite of the fact that another dictator, Napoleon, was dominant over much of Europe. Opposition to conscription in democratic countries has always rested on the fear of what state-controlled compulsion would do to the social structure of the society which tolerated it and upon the assumption that free men make better citizens than serfs. Today it is still true that democracy means more than equality, which might exist under conscription or totalitarianism. It implies more even than a sense of duty, which might also be imposed by force. An indispensable ingredient of democracy is individual liberty—the exercise of freedom of choice. Democracy is based on the daring faith, tested and proved by experience, that the average man will be responsible and cooperative when the state respects his inalienable right under God to life and liberty, to freedom from forcible seizure of his body or his service, to exemption from what the constitution calls "involuntary servitude which is not a penalty for crime." That faith is renounced the moment we adopt conscription.

The friend of democracy in his championship of liberty and the protestant Christian in his insistence upon the accountability of the individual to God, have a common stake in resisting conscription. All other arguments

against military compulsion depend upon this fundamental principle of liberty of choice for the individual in his dual capacity as a child of God and a citizen of the state. The exemptions provided in the Burke-Wadsworth bill providing for non-combatant service for "members of any well recognized religious sect whose creed or principles forbid its members to participate in war in any form" does not in any way satisfy this fundamental demand. Neither, incidentally, does it provide the intended exemption for even such a "well recognized sect" as the Society of Friends.

Other reasons why this proposal should be overwhelmed with opposition have been ably summarized in a notable "Declaration against Conscription" which has just been issued by more than two hundred educators, religious leaders, journalists and business men through the Committee on Militarism in Education, New York. They point out that conscription is undemocratic because it provides equality without liberty, making the equality that of "galley slaves," not of free men. Peacetime conscription, they say, is unnecessary; it is a violation of American tradition; it would widely dislocate business, industry, education and agriculture; it does not even have a military justification unless the government intends to invade another country. It "embraces the worst features of the totalitarian regimes." Citizens who agree with the signers of this declaration that there is no sufficient reason why "free Americans must now, in the name of freedom, submit to peacetime conscription and thereby become regimented vassals," should write Senator Sheppard, chairman of the senate military affairs committee, and to their two senators and congressman.

A DECLARATION AGAINST CONSCRIPTION

(A statement by the Committee on Militarism in Education, issued in July, 1940, New York City.)

The American people today are being deluged by propaganda for military conscription in peacetime. Sincere and distinguished as many of the proponents of conscription may be, and plausible as many of their contentions may seem, we, the undersigned, urge the American people and their representatives in Congress to deliberate with sober caution before permitting such an unprecedented innovation to become a part of our national life.

In our judgment military conscription in peacetime smacks of totalitarianism and we are convinced that its adoption would be highly dangerous to the spirit and traditions of American democracy. The reasons upon which we support this conviction are as follows:

First, the essential idea underlying military conscription is the major premise of every dictatorship and all totalitarianism. It is the assumption that the individual citizen is but a pawn in the hands of unlimited state power. Conscription has always been abhorent to free men because it is, in effect, a seizure of a man's body, time, and service by force and under threat of heavy penalty. For generations millions of Europeans have fled their native countries and become loyal and devoted American citizens in

order to enjoy, among other things, our freedom from conscription. Universal military service has been and is today the chief weapon by which dictators suppress free conscience among their people, inculcate them with the false ideals of chauvinistic nationalism, and indoctrinate them with belief in the superiority of brute force over morals and ideas. The adoption of conscription among Americans will be the opening wedge for the totalitarian dogma that individual citizens are pawns of the state from birth until death, without any rights which those in positions of power are bound to respect. Americans must not delude themselves with the belief that their democracy will remain unscathed if we adopt the essentially anti-democratic processes which have worked such havoc abroad.

Second, we consider that peacetime conscription is in itself a flagrant negation of democracy. We reject as transparent sophistry the contention that conscription under the name of "selective service" is democratic and that voluntary military service is undemocratic. The "equality" that conscription makes for us is akin to the "equality" which prevails among regimented galley slaves. It is no more democratic than any other form of involuntary servitude. Our American conception of democracy signifies vastly more than mere equality, for it also includes the great concepts of liberty and freedom for the individual. Furthermore, we deny that conscription can be justified by the assertion that it prevails in such democracies as England, Sweden and Switzerland. The conditions we face in the United States are in many respects widely different from and not comparable to those prevailing in European nations. For this reason valid conceptions of American democracy and military service must be derived from American history and tradition, not from contemporary European practices. In our view, peacetime conscription and American democracy are quite incompatible.

Third, the adoption of military conscription in peacetime would be a radical departure from historic American tradition. Never before in American history has it been thought necessary to resort to peacetime conscription for purposes of defense. This fact has been one of the truly glorious traditions of our American democracy; in common with most Americans we take pride in it, and we deny that the time has now come to abandon this feature of our national life because of the events in Europe, the gravity of which we well recognize. We are confident that the defense purposes numerated in the constitution—"to execute the laws of the union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasion"—can still be met and effectively discharged without resort to peacetime conscription. As ardently concerned for the safety of our beloved republic as any advocate of universal service can possibly be, we reject the suggestion that to preserve American democracy we must embrace the worst feature of the totalitarian regimes. We deny that free Americans must now, in the name of freedom, submit to peacetime conscription and thereby become regimented vassals of the national state.

Finally, we oppose conscription because of the disruption it will cause in our American way of life, and also because we question its necessity and wisdom as a defense measure. The military regimentation of the entire

manpower of our nation will inevitably result in widespread dislocation in business, industry, agriculture, and higher education; and it may prove unnecessary and ineffectual from a military standpoint. Conscription would have been unnecessary in 1917 if we had been raising a force for the defense of our territory rather than an army of five million men for service in Europe. Today the asserted need is for substantial expansion in our army, navy and air corps. If the personnel need is for highly trained permanent forces sufficient in number to man expertly the new weapons as they are produced, we contend that this need can best be met by voluntary enlistments under pay schedules sufficiently attractive to induce the required numbers to enroll. By such a procedure it may well be that the required enlistments could be obtained before the new weapons themselves are ready. This solution for the asserted need would seem to us to be vastly preferable to the alternative or organizing huge forces of partially trained civilians. It would be free of totalitarian semblance, as it would be in keeping with our democratic traditions and conceptions. Moreover, it would be based on a recognition of the military lesson being taught on European battlefields —that comparatively small forces of highly trained soldier-mechanics, properly equipped, can defeat many times their number of partially trained civilian conscripts regardless of how courageous the latter may be.

For these reasons, and for others, we appeal to all our fellow Americans who have a zealous regard for the preservation of their democratic institutions to identify themselves with the cause represented in this declaration.

STATEMENT OF NORMAN THOMAS

(Excerpts from a statement by Norman Thomas at the Hearings before the U. S. Senate Military Affairs Committee, Washington, D. C., July 11, 1940.)

I am aware that an elaborate effort is being made by powerful men and forces in this country to represent the compulsory military training bill as somehow valuable for democratic discipline and the inculcation of loyalty. The sufficient answer is to be found in the history of all great nations which have adopted conscription. Not one of you will seriously tell me or the American people that military conscription has made for democracy in Japan, Russia, Germany, or Italy; or preserved democracy and eradicated disloyalty in France, Belgium, or Holland. You will not tell me that the youth of conscript Europe are superior to the youth of comparatively free America. For individuals, military conscription is not freedom but serfdom; its equality is the equality of slaves.

No people would endure peacetime military conscription, its costs, its regimentation, and its compulsion for a single day except under the bitter constraint of real or alleged necessity for defense. Defense is a legitimate and necessary consideration of every government. But the United States, thanks to geography and history, is not in the position of France and Great Britain, much less of Switzerland. Unless we are to go in for foreign military adventures, we are concerned for a relatively easy defense, primarily

to be entrusted to the navy, the air force, and the highly trained operators of mechanized warfare. For these services no nation in the world looks to conscripts, called up for eight months or a year's service. It is the unanimous verdict of competent observers that it was the highly skilled, mechanized units of Germany which crushed the best of the old armies based on universal military training—the French.

Conscription jeopardizes the rights of labor. It gives reaction an instrument of repression. The Burke bill or any probable modification of it, if it became law, would be administered in accordance with regulations already drawn up by the joint army and navy selective service committee. The provisions for deferred service are very important. Class II (the deferred class) will include the highly skilled who would be more valuable to the war machine as workers than as soldiers. To enter a claim for occupational deferment, a worker will have to submit two affidavits, one by his immediate superior, another by the executive head of the enterprise in which he is employed. This rule gives the employer tremendous power over his workers. Confronted by the "ascending spiral" of a war economy, labor will demand higher pay. By refusing to endorse claims for occupational deferment, an employer can get rid of active labor elements by the simple device of seeing them off to war or, in peacetime, to the training camp. For antiunion employers, it is the chance of a lifetime. Claims for deferment by tenant farmers (and presumably sharecroppers) must be supported by affidavits from "the owner of the land or the latter's agent" and by a near neighbor.

If President Roosevelt's idea of training boys and girls for industry in connection with military defense should be adopted in the wording or execution of a conscription law, there is no way that can be devised in our capitalist country for such service to be used without imperiling all labor standards.

What we most should fear is the psychological effect of conscription on the American people, and the temptation these conscripts and reserves offer to military adventure. We are not little Switzerland, obviously incapable of anything but defense. We are a powerful nation with plenty of men and corporations hungry for the profits of imperialism. We have before tried this dollar diplomacy. What would some ambitious militarists and imperialists do with an army all dressed up and no place to go?

I asked a major in our reserve forces that question in a radio discussion and he thought he would use it primarily "to preserve order at home"; that is, keep labor in its place. I think it equally likely that we would soon use it to "keep order" in Mexico or some other American country where the temptation will be strong to go in for imperialism in the name of protection from possible aggression from abroad, much along the lines of Russian "protection" of the Baltic states or German "protection" of Denmark.

I am not insulting my own country and my own people when I say this. I am simply acknowledging that we are human and that on this nation all the pressure towards imperialism will operate in full force. A conscript

army is the ideal tool of such imperialism. Col. Lewis Sanders, testifying before your committee July 5, declared: "They (the registration provisions of the bill) will force an America unified in thought." This is precisely the goal of fascism; a nation so "unified in thought" can easily be manipulated into imperialist adventures. No strong tribe or nation has ever gone in for such a degree of navalism, militarism, armament economies, and conscription as we now contemplate without going in for imperialism. This is true from the days of the ancient Assyrians to the modern Japanese and Europeans. We will be no exception. In the name of defense, if we adopt conscription we shall enter the road whose end always has been and always will be not freedom but military regimentation, not peace but war.

You will observe, gentlemen, that my major objections are to conscription, not merely to this bill. I do not think Major Eliot, from whom I have quoted, makes a good case for his mild version of brief military training for the most physically fit of our youth. Still less do I approve President Roosevelt's amazing proposal for including girls and boys in his military conscription for combatant drill and industry. I am a good enough socialist and American to believe that 18-year-old girls—yes, and boys—can be better trained for jobs and life in their homes under healthy conditions than in any government military camp. Especially is this true if our major planning should not be for the conquest of other nations but of poverty.

It is not, however, with detail that I—and the socialist party which I represent—are chiefly concerned. It is with the preservation of the American way of life as against fascist regimentation and the type of conscription which has cost Europe so dearly. Your committee and the Congress of the United States will tragically fail in your duty to our people and democracy if you do not take advantage of the good fortune of our historic and geographic position which removes us from the temptation and excuse to follow in the paths which have led Europe to such unnecessary poverty, regimentation, war, and suffering.

DUKE SOCIOLOGIST ATTACKS CONSCRIPTION PLANS

(An article in the Durham Morning Herald for July 15, 1940.)

Declaring that the adoption of compulsory military training eventually "will make our soil, like that of Europe, red with human blood, Dr. Charles A. Ellwood, eminent Duke University sociologist and former president of the International Institute of Sociology, the American Sociological Society and many other organizations, author of many books and scores of briefer works, has written a letter to Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg protesting the proposed enactment of a bill by Congress establishing universal compulsory military training in peacetime in the United States.

His letter to Senator Vandenberg, which Professor Ellwood made public yesterday, is as follows:

"Many of us who have labored long and faithfully to preserve the true spirit of American institutions have been astonished and distressed that no adequate criticism has as yet been voiced in the United States senate of the

bill to establish universal compulsory military training in peacetime as a part of our national policy, something which has always characterized despotic governments and has been associated with civil and international wars. The fact that such a bill has been introduced by frightened friends of democracy should not restrain criticism. It is not a question of the immediate defense of the United States, but a question of future national policy. That should be kept clear, and I wish to point out to you, as a member of the senate, the grave dangers of such a policy.

"A propagandist for universal military training has maintained that it was born in democracy and started with the French Revolution. Such a statement is amazing from one who must be somewhat acquainted with human history. Leaving aside the universal compulsory military training often found in despotic primitive societies, such as the Incas of Peru and the Aztecs of Mexico; leaving aside also the approximations to such a policy by the Romans and other imperialistic peoples of antiquity; universal compulsory military training was first proposed for all citizens in modern times by Machiaveli, whose political philosophy was that the only end of state was power, and the only means to get and to keep power was justifiable. Aside from many experiments to carry out this doctrine, universal compulsory military training became general in France early in the eighteenth century. It was, in fact, one of the grievances which led to the French Revolution, although the French revolutionists, when attacked by other European states, adopted it in 1793 and 1798. It became the foundation for the career of Napoleon Bonaparte, who counted on an unlimited supply of young men for his armies. Without it, he never could have over-run Europe, just as Adolf Hitler, without it, never could have done the same thing. Adopted in practically all of the major European states in the nineteenth century, it became the very basis for the World War of 1914-18. In Russia, it was what made the Russian Revolution possible, because there would have been no Russian Revolution if the immense Russian army had not turned against the government.

"It is amazing that those who know these commonplace historical facts don't see that the adoption of this policy will make our soil, like that of Europe, red with human blood. There have been wars and revolutions, to be sure, without universal compulsory military training; but one of the sure ways to get changes of government by violence, is to arm the masses. Just as many a criminal has been made by placing a gun in his hands, so teaching the mass of citizens the methods and means of organized violence may be expected to produce in time class revolutions as well as international wars. A former officer in the United States army has said that citizens trained to military ideals and practices in peacetime will automatically carry those ideals and practices into government. The policy thus becomes a menace to personal liberty, although, he added, the modern militarist maintains his activities for the sake of peace! These words of wisdom should especially be borne in mind in view of the fact that all students of human society, without exception, agree that a prolonged war is inevitably followed by an economic depression. Economic depressions bring discontent, and if the masses are trained to military methods and armed, we can safely count on a revolution

in the United States within a dozen years after the present war closes; and revolutions cannot be put down when the masses have had military training and experience in arms.

"Moreover, as the military expert of the Kansas City Star, said in an article in that paper June 25, 'No direct attack on the United States proper is conceivable in the near future. . . . If the purpose of the United States is not to intervene in Europe in behalf of the democracies, then the need for vastly organized manpower is not at all urgent.' He points out also that the United States, with its peculiar position, could be better defended by a voluntarily recruited army of 400,000, and with a national guard of 250,000, with 100,000 reserve officers, than it could possibly be by universal conscription. This is what we are already approximating, and, in fact, already almost have. This military expert also points out that the all-round defense of the Americas requires no great manpower, but a great air force. Why therefore should we enter upon a permanent national policy which will teach our people to use the method of violence? Why should we burden them with an expense of untold billions on top of our already staggering national debt?

"Finally, it is impossible to maintain civil liberties with universal compulsory military training in peacetime. The conscience of the individual would have to be continually violated. Public discussion and condemnation of the policy of conscription would become forbidden by law, and we should pass from a free, democratic society to a fascist totalitarian state. Hitler would have triumphed, in spite of our arming against him!"

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Package libraries on the subject of universal military training may be obtained from the Library Extension Department of the University of North Carolina. These package libraries will be sold at 25 cents each. They will be ready for distribution on December 15, 1940. Address the Library Extension Department, Chapel Hill, N. C. Payment should accompany the order.

The H. W. Wilson Company will publish a number of the Reference Shelf on the subject, "Compulsory Military Training." The publication, compiled by Miss Julia E. Johnsen, will contain approximately 250 pages. The price will be $1.25. Address the H. W. Wilson Company, 950 University Avenue, New York, N. Y.

The August 14, 1940 number of Editorial Research Reports is devoted to the subject, "Conscription in the United States." The number was prepared by Buell W. Patch. This publication may be secured from Editorial Research Reports, 1013 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. The special rate, for debate use, is 50 cents a copy. The publication is 16 pages in length.

The University Extension Division of the University of North Carolina published in November, 1918, a 96-page debate handbook, entitled "Compulsory Military Training." A few copies of this publication are available. The price is 25 cents a copy. Address the University Extension Division, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

The Library of Congress has prepared a bibliography of the subject, "Compulsory Military Training." This bibliography will be furnished free of charge to high school libraries. Address the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Copies of the hearings before the Senate committee on military affairs on the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill may be secured from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. Inquire as to the price.

Copies of the hearings before the House committee on military affairs on the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill may be secured from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. Inquire as to the price.

United States Senators and Representatives in Congress will no doubt be able to furnish from congressional sources material bearing on the subject of compulsory military training.

The National Council for Prevention of War will probably be able to furnish some material bearing on the debate topic. Inquiries should be made of this organization at 532 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C.

The Military Training Camps Association will probably be able to furnish some material bearing on the debate subject. Inquiry should be made of this organization at 28 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

The Committee on Militarism in Education will probably be able to furnish some material bearing on the subject of compulsory military training. Inquiry should be made of this organization at 2929 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

Copies of the majority and minority reports of the Senate committee on military affairs on the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill may be secured from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. Inquire as to the price.

Copies of the majority and minority reports of the House committee on military affairs on the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill may be secured from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. Inquire as to the price.

American Magazine, volume 130, pages 16, 156-157, September, 1940. "Every Boy a Soldier." Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

American Mercury, volume 47, pages 256-267, July, 1939. "Impregnable America." H. W. Baldwin.

American Mercury, volume 50, pages 360-361, July, 1940. "Military Training." Eugene Lyons.

American Mercury, volume 50, pages 422-428, August, 1940. "Our Stake in the British Empire." J. T. Adams.

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 204, pages 49-53, July, 1939. "Defense of the Americas." G. F. Elliot.

Atlantic Monthly, volume 165, pages 39-45, January, 1940. "Air Force We Need." F. V. Drake.

Atlantic Monthly, volume 166, pages 1-7, July, 1940. "Hemisphere Defense." Louis Johnson.

Atlantic Monthly, volume 166, pages 404-409, October, 1940. "Hitting Power, Does Our Air Force Lack it?" F. V. Drake.

Business Week for June 8, 1940. Editorial, "We've Got the Men—But What Kind?"

Business Week for June 15, 1940. Editorial, "In Advance of the Need."

Chapel Hill Weekly for July 26, 1940. Editorial, "President Roosevelt Deserves the Nation's Gratitude for Championing Conscription."

Christian Century, volume 57, pages 894-895, July 17, 1940. Editorial, "No Conscription."

Christian Century, volume 57, pages 994-995, August 14, 1940. "If Conscription Comes." W. Hubben.

Christian Century, volume 57, pages 1054-1055, August 28, 1940. "Our Canadian Alliance and Leasing of Naval Bases in the Carribean." O. G. Villard.

Christian Century, volume 57, pages 1135-1137, September 18, 1940. "Without Benefit of the Constitution."

Collier's, volume 105, pages 18-19, June 22, 1940. "Our Defenseless Coast." Johnson Hagood.

Commercial and Financial Chronicle, volume 150, pages 4027-4029, June 29, 1940. Editorial, "Involuntary Servitude Must Not be Restored."

Current History, volume 30, pages 51-62, April, 1929. "Compulsory Military Training." Elbridge Colby.

Current History, volume 51, pages 13-14, December, 1939. "Can Hitler Invade America?" H. S. Johnson.

Current History, volume 51, pages 16-19, July, 1940. "Arms For America." Basil C. Walker.

Current History, volume 51, pages 32-36, August, 1940. "Mobilizing U. S. Manpower." Robert Strausz-Hupe.

Durham Herald for July 15, 1940. Article, "Duke Sociologist Attacks Conscription Plans."

Durham Herald for July 16, 1940. Editorial, "Adequate Criticism."

Durham Herald for July 24, 1940. Article, "Durham Young Men Approve Military Training Program."

Fortune, volume 20, page 116, December, 1939. Fortune Survey: "Would You Favor a Term of Compulsory Military Service For All Young Men of 18 or 19?"

Fortune, volume 22, pages 59-60, September, 1940. "U. S. Defenses: The Armed Forces."

Forum and Century, volume 103, pages 295-300, June, 1940. "What We Need for Defense." Oswald Garrison Villard.

Gastonia Gazette for August 10, 1940. Editorial, "Military Consciousness and Way of Life."

Gastonia Gazette for August 12, 1940. Editorial, "Hoey's Views."

Gastonia Gazette for September 1, 1940. Editorial, "Compulsory Military Training."

Gastonia Gazette for October 1, 1940. Editorial, "Youth Accepts Conscription Without Serious Opposition."

Greensboro News for June 22, 1940. Editorial, "Fitting Young Hands to the Sword."

Greensboro News for June 28, 1940. Editorial, "The Whole Picture."

Greensboro News for July 25, 1940. Editorial, "Of Drafting."

Greensboro News for July 28, 1940. Editorial, "Compulsory Military Training."

Greensboro News for August 6, 1940. Editorial, "General Versus Colonel."

Greensboro News for August 7, 1940. Editorial, "Add: Conscription."

Greensboro News for August 14, 1940. Editorial, "Concerning Conscription."

Greensboro News for August 17, 1940. Editorial, "Key to Defense."

Greensboro News for September 18, 1940. Editorial, "As Conscription Takes Hold."

Harper's Magazine, volume 180, pages 570-577, May, 1940. "Should We Buy Greenland?" E. P. Hanson.

Harper's Magazine, volume 181, pages 225-238, August, 1940. "Wanted: A Plan For Defense." H. W. Baldwin.

Harper's Magazine, volume 181, pages 344-353, September, 1940. "Lessons of 1917." F. L. Allen.

Kansas City Star for June 25, 1940. Article, "No Need to Rush."

Life, volume 9, pages 70-73, July 8, 1940. "Defense of America." G. F. Elliot.

Nation, volume 150, pages 723-724, June 15, 1940. "A Democratic Program of Defense." Freda Kirchwey.

Nation, volume 151, pages 85-88, August 3, 1940. "Conscripting America." M. S. Stewart, with reply by Freda Kirchwey.

New Republic, volume 102, pages 781-782, June 10, 1940. "What Are We to Defend?" George Soule.

New Republic, volume 103, pages 6-7, July 1, 1940. Editorial, "Universal Military Service."

New Republic, volume 103, pages 12-14, July 1, 1940. "What Can We Defend?" Fletcher Pratt.

New Republic, volume 103, pages 263-264, August 26, 1940. "Alliance With Canada."

New Republic, volume 103, pages 387-388, September 16, 1940. "Fifty-four Forty and Fight Too." W. Mulrooney.

Newsweek, volume 16, page 7, September 2, 1940. Article in the Periscope Section, "F. D. R. and Conscription."

Newsweek, volume 16, pages 15-16, September 16, 1940. "Swap of Destroyers for Bases Makes U. S. Dream Come True."

New York Times for June 3, 1940. Editorial, "Defending our Hemisphere."

New York Times for June 7, 1940. Editorial, "To Defend America."

New York Times for June 12, 1940. Editorial, "Democratic Universal Service."

New York Times for July 1, 1940. Article, "Universal Training."

New York Times for July 4, 1940. Article, "Dr. Conant's Statement on the Military Training Bill."

New York Times for July 5, 1940. Editorial, "For Military Training."

New York Times for July 10, 1940. Article, "Draft Law Vital, General Drum Asserts."

New York Times for July 10, 1940. Editorial, "Military Training."

New York Times for July 19, 1940. Editorial, "Production for Defense."

New York Times for July 24, 1940. "Senate Committee Backs Bill to Put Men Into Training."

New York Times for July 25, 1940. Editorial, "To Defend America."

New York Times for July 25, 1940. Article, "Job Safeguard Put Into Training Bill."

New York Times for August 5, 1940. Article, "Postponing Draft Held Fatal Error."

New York Times for August 26, 1940. Editorial, "What We Defend."

New York Times for August 29, 1940. Editorial, "Action in the Senate."

New York Times for August 30, 1940. Article, "Young Men Favor Compulsory Bill."

New York Times for September 1, 1940. "Draft Exception in College Asked." H. W. Chase.

New York Times for September 1, 1940. Article, "Defense Speedup."

New York Times for September 1, 1940. Article, "Right Men in Right Place."

New York Times for September 1, 1940. Article, "Nation's Armed Strength."

New York Times for September 4, 1940. Editorial, "Defense of the Atlantic World."

New York Times for September 18, 1940. Editorial, "What Conscription Means."

Raleigh News and Observer for July 7, 1940. Article, "Universal Draft Statute Old Story in This State."

Raleigh News and Observer for July 13, 1940. Article, "Tar Heel Solons Differ on Compulsory Training." Walter Brown.

Raleigh News and Observer for July 25, 1940. Editorial, "Compulsory Training."

Raleigh News and Observer for August 18, 1940. Editorial, "Army Wages."

Raleigh News and Observer for September 5, 1940. Editorial, "Supported by Country."

Reader's Digest, volume 37, pages 6-9, July, 1940. "Wake Up, America." W. Lippmann.

Saturday Evening Post, volume 212, pages 5-7, December 2, 1939. "Can They Bomb Us?" F. Pratt.

Saturday Evening Post, volume 212, pages 28, 50, June 22, 1940. Editorial, "And They Were Unprepared."

Scholastic, volume 37, pages 2, 10, September 16, 1940. "Uncle Sam Prepares For Trouble."

School and Society, volume 50, pages 53-54, July 27, 1940. Article, "Compulsory Conscription Arouses Discussion."

Time, volume 36, page 18, September 16, 1940. "New U. S. Bases: What the Bases Mean."

Vital Speeches of the Day, volume 6, page 268-270, February 15, 1940. "National Organization for War." George C. Marshall.

Vital Speeches of the Day, volume 6, pages 482-484, June 1, 1940. "The Dangers Which Confront Us." F. D. Roosevelt.

Vital Speeches of the Day, volume 6, pages 514-515, June 15, 1940. "The Future of the American People is at Stake." F. D. Roosevelt.

Vital Speeches of the Day, volume 6, pages 547-548, July 1, 1940. "What Shall We Defend?" R. M. Hutchins.

Vital Speeches of the Day, volume 6, pages 549-551, July 1, 1940. "Our Drift Toward War." C. A. Lindbergh.

Vital Speeches of the Day, volume 6, pages 551-552, July 1, 1940. "What Should Be America's Position?" Key Pittman.

Vital Speeches of the Day, volume 6, pages 627-629, August 1, 1940. "An Essential of Defense." Hugh A. Drum.

Vital Speeches of the Day, volume 6, pages 629-631, August 1, 1940. "Compulsory Military Training—For What?" F. C. Smith.

Vital Speeches of the Day, volume 6, page 646, August 15, 1940. "Keep War From the Americas." J. J. Pershing.

Vital Speeches of the Day, volume 6, pages 647-648, August 15, 1940. "Our Duty is Clear." H. L. Stimson.

Vital Speeches of the Day, volume 6, pages 689-692, September 1, 1940. "Marching Down the Road to War." B. K. Wheeler.

Vital Speeches of the Day, volume 6, pages 712-714, September 15, 1940. "We Must Prepare." F. D. Roosevelt.

Woman's Day, volume 3, pages 14-15, 60, September, 1940. "Your Children May Have to Face Military Training." J. Edgar Hoover.

Woman's Day, volume 4, pages 12-13, 53-54, October, 1940. "This is How We Feel About Conscription."

LIBRARY EXTENSION PUBLICATIONS

VOLUME III

1. October, 1936. *Adventures Around the World.* Lucile Kelling.
*2. January, 1937. *The Modern Woman.* E. C. Baity.
3. April, 1937. *Literary Backgrounds of Present Day Germany.* A. E. Zucker and W. P. Friederich.
4. May, 1937. *India in Revolution.* E. E. and E. E. Ericson.
5. June, 1937. *Adventures in Reading, Tenth Series.* A. B. Adams.
6. July, 1937. *The Theatre Today.* M. G. Holmes.

VOLUME IV

1. October, 1937. *Other People's Lives, Sixth Series.* C. S. Love.
2. January, 1938. *American Humor.* E. C. Downs & R. B. Downs.
3. April, 1938. *Contemporary Poetry.* Lucile Kelling.
4. May, 1938. *Building and Furnishing a Home.* E. C. Baity.
*5. June, 1938. *Adventures in Reading, Eleventh Series.* A. B. Adams.
6. July, 1938. *Famous Women of Yesterday and Today.* Third Edition. C. S. Love.

VOLUME V

1. October, 1938. *Political Problems in Present-Day Europe. First Series.* Werner P. Friederich.
2. January, 1939. *Political Problems in Present-Day Europe. Second Series.* C. B. Robson, C. H. Pegg, A. B. Dugan, and J. L. Godfrey.
3. April, 1939. *Adventures in Reading, Twelfth Series.* A. B. Adams.
4. May, 1939. *The Modern Woman's Bookshelf.* E. C. Baity.
5. June, 1939. *Adventures Around the World, Second Series.* Lucile Kelling.
6. July, 1939. *At Home with the Fine Arts.* M. G. Holmes.

VOLUME VI

1. October, 1939. *The New Frontier.* W. W. Drake.
2. January, 1940. *United States Mural; a study of regional novels.* Lucile Kelling.
3. April, 1940. *Adventures in Reading, Thirteenth Series.* A. B. Adams.
4. May, 1940. *Other People's Lives, Seventh Series.* C. S. Love.
5. June, 1940. *Adventures with Opera.* A. D. McCall.
6. July, 1940. *Arts of the Georgian Period.* M. N. Bond.

---

* Out of print. Available only as loan.

Single copies, 50 cents each; in North Carolina, 25 cents.

One complete volume, advance subscription, six numbers, $2.00; to residents of North Carolina, $1.00.

Copies will be sent on approval, if requested.

For further information, write to

THE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION LIBRARY
CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

FEB 24 1941

U. C.
Period.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
EXTENSION BULLETIN

VOL. XX SEPTEMBER, 1940 NO. 2

ACADEMIC CONTESTS FOR NORTH CAROLINA HIGH SCHOOLS

Announcement for the Year 1940-41

Published six times a year, July, September, October, November, January, and March, by the University of North Carolina Press. Entered as second-class matter October 19, 1921, Chapel Hill, N. C.

EXTENSION BULLETINS

Vol.	IV, No. 12.	*Children of Old Carolina.* Historical Pageant for Children. Ethel T. Rockwell. Price 25c.
Vol.	VII, No. 9.	*Special Legal Relations of Married Women in N. C. as to Property, Contracts, and Guardianships.* Mary P. Smith. Price 25c.
Vol.	VIII, No. 5.	*The World Court.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	VIII, No. 7.	*Scenery and Lighting for School and Little Theatre Stages.* Samuel Selden. Price 50c.
Vol.	IX, No. 4.	*The Classification of Property for Taxation.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	X, No. 5.	*Independence for the Philippines.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XI, No. 3.	*Compulsory Unemployment Insurance.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XII, No. 5.	*The Sales Tax.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XIII, No. 3.	*Radio Control and Operation.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XIV, No. 2.	*Federal Aid to Education.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XV, No. 1.	*Play Producing for Schools and Little Theatres.* Frederick H. Koch and staff members of the Carolina Playmakers. Price 50c.
Vol.	XV, No. 2.	*Socialization of Medicine.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVI, No. 2.	*Government Ownership and Operation of Electric Utilities.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVI, No. 4.	*Plays for Schools and Little Theatres (Revised).* Price 50c.
Vol.	XVII, No. 3.	*Unicameral Legislatures.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVII, No. 4.	*First Principles of Play Direction.* Samuel Selden. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVIII, No. 2.	*Anglo-American Alliance.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XIX, No. 1.	*Audio Visual Aids to Schools, Colleges, Churches, and Adult Study Groups.* Free.
Vol.	XIX, No. 2.	*Government Ownership and Operation of the Railroads.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XIX, No. 4.	*Fourth Annual North Carolina School Art Exhibition.* Announcement for the year 1940-41. Free.
Vol.	XX, No. 1.	*Universal Military Training.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50 cents.
Vol.	XX, No. 2.	*Academic Contests for North Carolina High Schools.* Announcement for the year 1940-41. Free.

MONEY ORDERS, CHECKS, OR STAMPS ACCEPTED

ADDRESS: UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION,
CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

ACADEMIC CONTESTS FOR NORTH CAROLINA HIGH SCHOOLS

Announcement

Announcement is made in this number of the University of North Carolina Extension Bulletin of the regulations which will govern the following academic contests for North Carolina high schools, to be conducted in the spring of 1941: the seventeenth annual high school Latin contest, the sixteenth annual high school French contest, the sixteenth annual high school Spanish contest, the sixteenth annual high school Mathematics contest, and the fourth annual high school Physics contest.

By means of these contests the University Extension Division and the several departments concerned of the University of North Carolina hope to render a service to the high schools through an increase in the interest of North Carolina high school students in the field of scholarship, particularly in the study of the designated subjects, Latin, French, Spanish, Mathematics, and Physics. Since these contests were inaugurated, with the first annual high school Latin contest held on February 18, 1925, they have met with a very cordial reception on the part of the high schools of the State. The central committee at the University hopes that the contests will be found helpful by the high schools and that they will prove generally successful this year.

The dates for the holding of these different contests are as follows: Physics contest, February 7; Latin contest, February 14; Spanish contest, March 7; French contest, March 21; and Mathematics contest, April 25.

All accredited North Carolina public high schools are invited to enter the contests. The school officials whose schools plan to enter the contests should notify E. R. Rankin, Secretary, at Chapel Hill, at their earliest convenience regarding the number of pupils whom they will have to enter the different contests.

The attention of school officials and teachers is called to the following general regulations, which will apply to all five of the high school academic contests, and to the special regulations which will govern each particular contest.

GENERAL REGULATIONS

1. The University Extension Division and the several departments concerned of the University of North Carolina will conduct, with the cooperation of participating high schools, contests in the spring of 1941 in Physics, Latin, Spanish, French, and Mathematics for high school students, participation in these contests being open to accredited North Carolina public high schools.

2. The contests will be conducted in all cases under the direct supervision of the superintendents, high school principals, or teachers in the schools.

3. No student who has already been graduated from a high school shall be eligible to participate in the academic contests.

4. It is necessary for all students to be regularly enrolled in their high schools at the time of their participation in the academic contests.

5. The tests in all of these contests will be forwarded from Chapel Hill to the individual schools in sealed envelopes, which are not to be opened until the time when the examinations are given.

6. It will be necessary in each case that the individual student give a pledge stating that no help has been given or received on the test.

Superintendents, principals, or teachers in charge of the contests will give assurance to the committee that the contests have been properly conducted and that all of the regulations and conditions pertaining to the contests have been observed.

THE HIGH SCHOOL PHYSICS CONTEST

1. The contest will take place throughout the State on February 7, 1941.

2. Students who may take part in the Physics contest are limited to members of the sophomore, junior, and senior classes.

3. The examination will cover the topics of mechanics and heat.

4. The individual school will send its papers to the Secretary of the Physics Contest Committee at Chapel Hill by February 12, 1941.

5. The papers from the various high schools will be graded by faculty members of the Department of Physics of the University. Announcement will be made of the school whose student wins first place. Honorable mention will be given to several schools whose students submit next best papers.

6. All schools deciding to enter the Physics contest will notify the committee at Chapel Hill not later than February 3 of their plan to participate and will also notify this committee as to the number of students of the particular school who will wish to enter the contest.

THE HIGH SCHOOL LATIN CONTEST

1. The contest will take place throughout the State on February 14, 1941.

2. Students who may take part in the Latin contest are limited to members of the sophomore, junior, and senior classes. It is regarded as inadvisable for students to attempt the examination who have not had at least a full year of Latin.

3. This examination will require (1) an ability to translate passages of comparatively easy Latin, will include (2) questions on form and syntax based on such passages, and will include (3) questions involving a general knowledge of grammar.

4. The individual school will select the best three papers from the total of the papers submitted in the local contest and will send these three papers to the Secretary of the Latin Contest Committee at Chapel Hill by February 21, 1941.

5. The papers, as they are sent in by the various high schools, will be graded by faculty members of the Department of Latin of the University. Announcement will be made of the school whose student wins first place. Honorable mention will be given to several schools whose students submit next best papers.

6. All schools deciding to enter the contest will notify the committee at Chapel Hill not later than February 10 of their plan to participate and will also notify this committee as to the number of students of the particular high school who will wish to enter the contest.

THE HIGH SCHOOL SPANISH CONTEST

1. The contest will take place throughout the State on March 7, 1941.

2. Students who may take part in the Spanish contest are limited to the sophomore, junior, and senior classes. The contest will be of a practical nature, enabling the student to show what facility he has acquired in handling Spanish verbs, grammar, and reading.

3. The individual school will select the best three papers from the total of the papers submitted in the local contest and will send these three papers to the Secretary of the Spanish Contest Committee at Chapel Hill by March 13, 1941. *The high school teacher is expected to score and to record the number of errors in each paper which is sent to Chapel Hill. Papers which have not been scored and on which the errors have not been recorded will be automatically disqualified.*

4. The papers from the various high schools will be graded by faculty members of the Department of Spanish of the University. Announcement will be made of the school whose student wins first place. Honorable mention will be given to several schools whose students submit next best papers.

5. All schools deciding to enter the contest will notify the committee at Chapel Hill not later than March 3 of their plan to participate and will also notify this committee as to the number of students of the particular high school who will wish to enter the contest.

THE HIGH SCHOOL FRENCH CONTEST

1. The contest will take place throughout the State on March 21, 1941.

2. The high school French contest is intended only for students in second year French who have had no special advantages nor private instruction in the language.

3. The scope of the contest will include: (1) a vocabulary test, (2) the conjugation of several representative verbs, (3) the composing of French sentences illustrating different grammatical points, and (4) a reading test.

4. The individual school will select the best three papers from the total of papers submitted in the local contest and will send these three papers to the Secretary of the French Contest Committee at Chapel Hill by March 27, 1941. *The high school teacher is expected to score and to record the number of errors in each paper which is sent to Chapel Hill. Papers which have not been scored and on which the errors have not been recorded will be automatically disqualified.*

5. The papers from the various high schools will be graded by faculty members of the Department of French of the University. Announcement will be made of the three best individual papers in order of excellence, with honorable mention to the next above. Announcement will also be made of the three schools whose three-student teams make the best showing.

6. All schools deciding to enter the contest will notify the committee at Chapel Hill not later than March 17 of their plan to participate and will also notify this committee as to the number of students of the particular high school who will wish to enter the contest.

THE HIGH SCHOOL MATHEMATICS CONTEST

1. The high school Mathematics contest will take place throughout the State on April 25, 1941.

2. Students who may take part in the Mathematics contest are limited to members of the sophomore, junior, and senior classes.

3. The scope of the contest will include: (1) an arithmetic test, (2) an algebra test, and (3) a plane geometry test, ten questions in each.

4. The individual school will select the best paper from the total of papers submitted in the local contest and will send this paper to E. R. Rankin, Secretary of the Mathematics Contest Committee, at Chapel Hill by May 2, 1941. Only one paper is to be sent to Chapel Hill from each school. Each paper submitted in the contest must carry the name of the writer, the name and address of the school, and the name of the principal.

5. The papers, as they are sent in by the various schools, will be graded by faculty members of the Department of Mathematics of the University. Announcement will be made of the school whose student wins first place. Honorable mention will be given to several schools whose students submit next best papers.

6. All schools deciding to enter the contest will notify the committee at Chapel Hill not later than April 21 of their plan to participate and will also notify this committee as to the number of students of the particular high school who will wish to enter the contest.

WINNERS OF ACADEMIC CONTESTS IN THE PAST

THE LATIN CONTEST

Charlotte High School, 1925; Lillington High School, 1926; Wilson High School, 1927; Roxboro High School, 1928; Durham High School, 1929; Durham High School, 1930; Durham High School, 1931; Roxboro High School, 1932; Wilson High School, 1933; Durham High School, 1934; Wilson High School, 1935; Statesville High School, 1936; Durham High School, 1937; Durham High School, 1938; Durham High School, 1939; Charlotte High School, 1940.

THE FRENCH CONTEST

Raleigh High School, 1926; Davidson High School, 1927; Forest City High School, 1928; Lenoir High School, 1929; Greensboro High School, 1930; Fayetteville High School, 1931; Louisburg High School (tie), 1932; Sylva High School (tie), 1932; Oxford High School, 1933; Louisburg High School, 1934; Louisburg High School, 1935; Louisburg High School, 1936; Albemarle High School (tie), 1937; Rockingham High School (tie), 1937; Richard J. Reynolds High School, 1938; Wakelon High School, 1939; Greensboro High School, 1940.

THE SPANISH CONTEST

Statesville High School, 1926; Statesville High School, 1927; Reidsville High School, 1928; Albemarle High School, 1929; Albemarle High School, 1930; Fayetteville High School, 1931; Gastonia High School, 1932; Gastonia High School, 1933; Gastonia High School, 1934; Gastonia High School, 1935; Gastonia High School, 1936; Rocky Mount High School, 1937; Rocky Mount High School, 1938; Gastonia High School, 1939; Broughton High School, 1940.

THE MATHEMATICS CONTEST

Ayden High School, 1926; Charlotte High School, 1927; Ahoskie High School, 1928; Rocky Mount High School, 1929; Greensboro High School, 1930; Greensboro High School, 1931; Durham High School, 1932; Durham High School, 1933; Broughton High School, 1934; Albemarle High School, 1935; Durham High School, 1936; Charlotte High School, 1937; Broughton High School, 1938; Durham High School, 1939; Durham High School, 1940.

THE PHYSICS CONTEST

Sanford High School (tie), 1938; Southern Pines High School (tie), 1938; Charlotte High School, 1939; Greensboro High School, 1940.

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SERVICES

The University of North Carolina offers, through the Extension Division, the following services to the people of the State:

Correspondence Instruction. One hundred and thirty university courses are offered by mail. These courses carry college and certification credit. High school graduates and others unable to attend college find home-study an economical and satisfactory method of continuing their education.

Extension Class Instruction. Late afternoon, evening, and Saturday classes are organized wherever enough enrollments to cover expenses are secured. Courses of both vocational and cultural nature are offered, with college credit, if desired.

Library Service. Reading courses, books, and reference materials are loaned to individuals and groups interested in the systematic study and discussion of literary, historical, social, and other subjects. There are available about fifty outlines for study suitable for women's clubs or other groups.

Lectures. Popular and technical lectures and readings by members of the faculty are arranged for schools, clubs, and other community organizations. Lecture courses either on a particular subject or on a series of topics may be obtained. Short courses and institutes are held at the University for groups interested in intensive training and instructional programs.

Dramatic Arts. Assistance is given in organization for dramatic activities, in play selection and production, and in the loan of playbooks and other library material. An annual tournament is conducted in coöperation with the Carolina Dramatic Association.

Interscholastic Activities. In coöperation with several University departments and state agencies, the Division conducts annual contests in debating, athletics, and academic subjects. A coaching school is held each summer for high school coaches and athletic directors.

Publications. *The University News Letter,* containing the results of studies made of economic and social conditions in North Carolina, is sent free to residents of the State. There are also issued annually several numbers of *The Extension Bulletin* containing information of interest to general readers.

For information concerning any of these services, write to the UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION, Chapel Hill, N. C.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
EXTENSION BULLETIN

VOL. XX OCTOBER, 1940 NO. 3

INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS INTERPRETATIONS

with

An Analysis of Inter-American Conferences, 1938-1940

CHAPEL HILL MCMXLI
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS

EXTENSION BULLETINS

Vol.	IV, No. 12.	*Children of Old Carolina.* Historical Pageant for Children. Ethel T. Rockwell. Price 25c.
Vol.	VII, No. 9.	*Special Legal Relations of Married Women in N. C. as to Property, Contracts, and Guardianships.* Mary P. Smith. Price 25c.
Vol.	VIII, No. 5.	*The World Court.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	VIII, No. 7.	*Scenery and Lighting for School and Little Theatre Stages.* Samuel Selden. Price 50c.
Vol.	IX, No. 4.	*The Classification of Property for Taxation.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	X, No. 5.	*Independence for the Philippines.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XI, No. 3.	*Compulsory Unemployment Insurance.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XII, No. 5.	*The Sales Tax.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XIII, No. 3.	*Radio Control and Operation.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XIV, No. 2.	*Federal Aid to Education.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XV, No. 1.	*Play Producing for Schools and Little Theatres.* Frederick H. Koch and staff members of the Carolina Playmakers. Price 50c.
Vol.	XV, No. 2.	*Socialization of Medicine.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVI, No. 2.	*Government Ownership and Operation of Electric Utilities.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVI, No. 4.	*Plays for Schools and Little Theatres (Revised).* Price 50c.
Vol.	XVII, No. 3.	*Unicameral Legislatures.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVII, No. 4.	*First Principles of Play Direction.* Samuel Selden. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVIII, No. 2.	*Anglo-American Alliance.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XIX, No. 1.	*Audio Visual Aids to Schools, Colleges, Churches, and Adult Study Groups.* Free.
Vol.	XIX, No. 2.	*Government Ownership and Operation of the Railroads.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XIX, No. 4.	*Fourth Annual North Carolina School Art Exhibition.* Announcement for the year 1940-41. Free.
Vol.	XX, No. 1.	*Universal Military Training.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50 cents.
Vol.	XX, No. 2.	*Academic Contests for North Carolina High Schools.* Announcement for the year 1940-41. Free.
Vol.	XX, No. 3.	*Inter-American Relations.* Price 25c.

MONEY ORDERS, CHECKS, OR STAMPS ACCEPTED

ADDRESS: UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION,
CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
EXTENSION BULLETIN

VOL. XX OCTOBER, 1940 NO. 3

INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS INTERPRETATIONS

with

An Analysis of Inter-American Conferences, 1938-1940

Published six times a year, July, September, October, November, January, and March, by the University of North Carolina Press. Entered as second-class matter October 19, 1921, Chapel Hill, N. C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Foreword 4

What is Pan Americanism? 5
Bernard J. Flatow

Cultural Relations with Latin America 7
Dr. Sturgis E. Leavitt

An Inter-American University 9
Dr. Frank P. Graham

Our Trade with Latin America 11
Mark Taylor Orr

Inter-American Political Relations 16
Dr. William W. Pierson

The Eighth Pan American Conference, Lima, Peru, December, 1938 20
Bernard J. Flatow

The First Consultative Conference of American Foreign Ministers, Panama, September, 1939 35
Bernard J. Flatow

The Second Consultative Conference of American Foreign Ministers, Havana, July, 1940 41
Bernard J. Flatow

Suggested Bibliography 46

FOREWORD

Never before have the relations between Latin America and the United States been on a more friendly and realistic basis. Throughout Latin America there is a demand for news about the United States, and similarly the American people are asking for more information about their southern neighbors. It is hoped that this Bulletin will throw some light on the political, cultural, and economic relations between our country and the twenty Latin American republics, and that it will give the general reader an insight into current trends in Inter-American affairs.

The first five articles were prepared especially for a meeting, sponsored by the Pan American Club of the University of North Carolina, at Chapel Hill, April 14, 1940, in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Pan American Union.

Grateful acknowledegment is made to Bernard J. Flatow, President of the Pan American Club, who prepared the analyses of three Inter-American Conferences, and who generously contributed his time to the publication of this Bulletin.

This issue of the University of North Carolina Extension Bulletin is dedicated to those men and women of both continents who are working to further the harmonious relationship so desirable for the preservation of peace in the Western Hemisphere.

WHAT IS PAN AMERICANISM?

BERNARD J. FLATOW

President, Pan American Club, University of North Carolina

In attempting to answer the question, "What is Pan Americanism?" it is well to recognize one's limitations. Pan Americanism is one of those vague terms, such as liberty, democracy, freedom of speech, and many others, whose existence is found only in the minds of men. There is no exact defintion of the term. From a philological point of view, the word "Pan" means "all," and thus, Pan Americanism may be interpreted as a cooperative effort for peace and security among all of the nations of the two American continents.

Below the Rio Grande are twenty independent nations, each with a background and a culture that are different from those with which we are familiar. They, as we, represent many different racial strains. Eighteen of those countries speak the Spanish language; one speaks Portuguese; one speaks French. The reasons for this variation are part of another story. Suffice it to say that because of exploration and conquest by Spaniards in the early 16th. and 17th. centuries, a great deal of the land came under the domination of Spain, then the foremost world power.

In the early part of the 19th. century, these colonies cut themselves loose from Spanish rule and set themselves up as independent sovereign nations. One of the persons largely responsible for this transformation was Simon Bolivar, a Venezuelan, the "Father" of Latin American independence. Bolivar was enough of a realist to know that none of the countries was likely to maintain its newly-found freedom by remaining apart from the others. He realized that what was needed was a union, which, after all, is the basis of strength. Therefore, in 1826, he called a meeting of the various nations, at Panama, in order to form such a union. However, this first attempt failed because of the disinclination of several countries to participate. Then, too, the delegation from the United States did not arrive until after the conference had adjourned. American federation, thus, received its first set-back.

In the interim of the next sixty years, several efforts towards "continental solidarity" met with the same result. But, in 1889, the Government of the United States acted as host to most of the Latin American nations at a general conference in Washington, D. C., called in order to discuss problems of mutual interest. This was the First International Conference of American States, more commonly known as the First Pan American Conference. Before the delegates adjourned, they had set up the International Bureau of the American Republics, which later became known as the Pan American Union. Thus, the first great step had been taken; a permanent agency had been established to facilitate inter-American *rapprochement.*

In addition to that first meeting, seven other International Conferences of American States have been held. The aim of all these meetings has been to bring all of the independent American nations into a closer and more friendly relationship by means of cooperation in all fields. Each succeeding conference has been marked by a distinct trend toward a more realistic discussion of problems common to all the Americas.

Besides these regular Pan American Conferences which convene once every five years, many others of a highly specialized nature have taken place. The main subjects of these meetings have been sanitation, communications, finance, scientific advancement, cultural cooperation, agriculture, and international law.

Prior to 1933, the path of Pan American friendship had been none too smooth; not because of any major conflicts between the natures of the people, but due mainly to the misguided commercial policies of some North American businessmen.

However, since the advent of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, changes of the utmost significance have occurred; changes which have overcome many of the obstacles to a successful Pan American accord; changes which may well go down in history as proof of the democratic principles behind the Good Neighbor policy. We withdrew our marines from Nicaragua, we abrogated the Platt Amendment which Cuba had considered an encroachment upon her national sovereignty, and we recognized the sovereignty of all countries, regardless of size.

These changes in the policy of the United States have greatly impressed our neighbors to the South.

One of the most extensive programs of cultural cooperation ever undertaken has been founded upon the good faith expressed in the Good Neighbor policy. Students, schools, libraries, labor groups, musical organizations, scientific institutions, and a host of other progressive forces in all of the countries have embarked on programs of correspondence and interchange, in order to further the understanding of the American cultures throughout the American Hemisphere.

This cultural program may well become the basis for the ideal Pan Americanism, which is an "intellectual Pan Americanism."

If we are to retain the Latin American countries as our friends, we must first make an effort to understand them and their ideas; we must not make the mistake of looking upon them as inferior people; and we must extend to them the open hand of fellowship as proof of our peaceful intentions.

Thus established, Pan Americanism would not become an American Zollverein nor another Anschluss, but a vivid example to the Old World that America wants peace and knows how to get it.

CULTURAL RELATIONS WITH LATIN AMERICA

DR. STURGIS E. LEAVITT

Professor of Spanish, University of North Carolina

The fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union marks a high point in the history of cultural relations between the United States and her southern neighbors. Never before has there been such an interest in Latin America as is manifest today. Parties are being organized to visit the southern republics, books about Latin America are in greater demand, courses in Latin American history and literature are being introduced into college after college, and exchanges of students and professors are being arranged on a scale never dreamed of before. Two years ago an exhibition of North American books was sent to Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina, and last year an exhibit of Spanish books toured the United States. In 1940 the University of Florida held a series of round table discussions on the teaching of Latin American subjects. In the summer, the University of Texas played host to an elaborate Latin American Institute, and in August the University of California sponsored the Second International Congress of Teachers of Latin American Literature. This is only a small part of a large picture.

Last year the first Summer School for North Americans was held at the University of San Marcos in Lima, Peru. This year a similar institute has been held for South Americans at the University of North Carolina. Both ventures proved highly successful in developing a spirit of true understanding.

The Pan American Union at first had little to do with cultural relations, but in recent years it has been very active in this field. Through the Division of Intellectual Cooperation it has systematically been building up its library collection, has made surveys of Latin American activities in the United States, and collected all sorts of information about Latin American literature, art, languages and folklore. It has made the facilities of the Union more accessible to the public, and has actively participated in almost every conference that would encourage a better understanding between the two continents.

If the friendly relations that now exist are to continue on a sound basis, they must rest to a large extent upon mutual understanding. This highly desirable situation will not come about just by wishing for it. A brief visit to the Latin American countries is not enough, nor is the reading of a travel book or two. Acquaintance with a few books from Latin American literature will not be sufficient, either. If friendly relations are to endure, there must be built up a systematic understanding of the problems confronting the different countries, an appreciation of what each country can offer to the others in a cultural way, and some idea of our neighbors' ideals and attitudes toward life in general.

It is encouraging to see that all along the line efforts are being made to do what the Pan American Union has been doing, namely, to coordinate all activities that deal with Latin America. The American Council of Learned Socie-

ties, for example, through its committee on Latin American Studies, is trying to develop little known fields such as the study of Portuguese, Latin American art and architecture. Through the *Handbook of Latin American Studies,* which it sponsors, it is combining in a single volume, such disciplines as history, geography, anthropology, art, music, law, language, literature, folklore, and economics.

The Institute at Texas, following the example set at Ann Arbor last year, is offering a range of courses in history, geography, art, literature, language and trade relations. The Department of State, long concerned with political matters alone, has, through the recently created Division of Cultural Relations, become interested in the significance of culture. Universities are concerned with breaking down department lines and coordinating courses in different fields, offering an interdepartmental major in Latin American studies in which courses in geography, history, languages, literature, and trade relations are made available to the student. Even business firms are bringing Latin American students to the United States for study and are offering fellowships to North American students to study in Latin America.

There are signs that people in the United States are beginning to see Latin America as it is. It ie high time that we gave up the idea that it is a region of perpetual revolution, or a land of golden opportunity for anyone with neither brains, money, nor a job. The people of Latin America are having a tough time, just as we are. They have plenty of problems, just as we do. But, if we can help them solve their problems, we shall in turn be on the way to solving ours.

The United States has a unique opportunity to show the world that a powerful country can live at peace with its smaller neighbors. It may not be imperative for all to act together in defense of our shores, for by standing together such a step may become unnecessary. However, we do hope that Good Will, an angel that is fast becoming a lonely stranger in a troubled world, will abide in our midst and lend a hand in settling the problems of this hemisphere. If we invite her to stay, perhaps the newer civilization of the western world can succeed where the rest of the world has failed.

AN INTER-AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM

President, University of North Carolina

The dream of an inter-American University in Puerto Rico has long been in the minds of people both in Puerto Rico and in the United States. This joint aspiration has a solid geographic basis in the position of Puerto Rico as a focus of the island groups between the Atlantic Ocean and the Caribbean Sea and as midway between the two Americas. It is the only historic seat of Hispanic-American culture under the American flag. Puerto Rico is educationally bilingual. The people have economic and political connections and democratic associations with the people of the United States. They have historic, racial, cultural, and spiritual identification with the peoples of Latin America. Puerto Rico is already the seat of a rising and potentially modern democratic university. This university is already the home of a joint Puerto Rican-American inter-university school of tropical medicine, tested as a scientific link in the service of the knowledge and health of the peoples of the Americas. In Puerto Rico are already the promising beginnings of insular and federal cooperative agencies of experimental agricultural research on an island which makes available for agricultural science more tropical plants than any other place in the Western Hemisphere and, except Java, any other place in the world. With these resources, the University of Puerto Rico can become a pan-tropical university in both agricultural and medical research.

At the tropical crossways of the western islands and continents, where meet the Old World and the New, North and South, mountain and plain, ocean and sea, Anglo-American and Hispanic-American peoples and cultures, Puerto Rico is geographically unique and spiritually strategic for the development of an insular, national, and international university, pan-tropical in science, and inter-American in the service of the West Indian Islands and the American continents. This is the dream and this is the possibility for the University of Puerto Rico.

For the eventual realization of this dream, the insular and inter-American university to be composed of many undergraduate colleges, professional schools, experiment stations, extension divisions, special institutes for research, the university press, and the all-university graduate school, should be unified in structure and government in one manifold integrated university. The organization and policies of the integrated university, by the very nature of its many relations and in the very diversity of its many services, should have horizontal and vertical flexibility for both adaptation to meet any need and for expansion to include all developments vital to the people of the island, the services of the tropics and the purposes of an inter-American university. The financial support, the board of trustees, the regular faculty, the student body, the undergraduate scholarships, the graduate fellowships, the exchange professorships, the library and the laboratories, the research projects and publications, and the wide and various university services should reflect both the insular and continental nature of this inter-American university.

In keeping with the spirit of democracy, the students should have the wise freedom of assembly, organization, discussion, publication, and campus self-government which obtains in the student life of the most democratic universities. The faculty should, in procedures and integrity of appointments, in character, personality, training, teaching ability, productive scholarship, and salary scales; in security of tenure, academic freedom, and autonomous participation, through elected representatives; in the policy making and government of the university, represent the best practices of the leading universities of the world. With a student body more gradually self-governing and with a faculty more autonomously sharing in the processes and policies of the university, the President will have the democratic and spiritual reenforcements for interpreting the university to the people and the people to the university, and for that educational statesmanship required in the development of a great university and the building of a nobler commonwealth. With such executive leadership, the trustees, faculty, and student body will all become moral guarantees of the freedom and integrity of the development of the University of Puerto Rico as a great seat of inter-cultural exchange, international appreciation, and neighborly good will; an inspiring source of intellectual, economic, social, and spiritual progress, and an inter-American stronghold of democracy in our western world.

OUR TRADE WITH LATIN AMERICA

MARK TAYLOR ORR, *Assistant Secretary,*

The Southern Council on International Relations

Southward to the twenty Latin American Republics, the United States ships nearly one-fifth of its exports. Our southern neighbors buy more than a third of their imports from us, and we take a fourth of our imports from them. In recent years this exchange has amounted to approximately one billion dollars annually—about equal to our Asiatic trade, about half our trade with Europe.

For a long time the United States has been the best customer for Latin American exports, and likewise we are the most important supplier of what Latin America buys abroad.

Germany supplies 15 per cent of their imports and buys around ten per cent of their exports. Great Britain, as the second largest market for Latin America, has been taking from 16 to 20 per cent of the aggregate value of its exports. The British share of the Latin American imports is slightly less than that of Germany.

Latin America, considered as a whole, has been taking 40 per cent of all we sell abroad of the products of our dairies, of our steel and flour mills, our medicines, and our railway equipment; between 30 and 40 per cent of our exports of manufactured products in rubber, cotton, rayon, and in electric, iron and steel machinery; and only slightly less of our automobiles, lumber, leather, and agricultural machinery.

From Latin America we import all of our quebracho extract and cigar leaf tobacco; most of our coffee, bananas, chocolate, flaxseed and nitrates; a large part of our sugar, hides and skins, raw wool, copper, antimony and manganese.

Our principal trade in dollars with Latin American countries is usually in the following order: Cuba, Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, and Colombia. Because of our great imports of sugar from Cuba and coffee from Brazil we normally buy more from these two countries than we sell. However, in the case of Mexico, Argentina, and Venezuela, we usually sell considerably more than we buy. This is a disadvantage to these countries which require a surplus of commodity exports over imports sufficient in value to provide for payment of interest and dividends on foreign investments, shipping services, and other items necessitating exportation of capital.

Our exports to Lain America have been affected by three principal factors:

1. Competition from other countries, especially Great Britain and Germany:
2. The commercial policies of the Latin American countries themselves;
3. The volume of Latin American exports.

Competition on the part of Germany and Great Britain has not been severe. German advances have been made at the expense of Great Britain. Our share, both of imports and exports, is steadily increasing. In 1938, the trade of the United States was exceeded by Great Britain only

in the case of Argentina and Uruguay. In nine out of the twenty countries of Latin America, the United States provides more than fifty per cent of the imports. These countries are: Colombia, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama and Venezuela.

The policy of the German government in making barter agreements with many of the Latin American countries has operated in direct opposition to the most-favored-nation reciprocal trading agreements program pursued by Secretary Hull. The German barter system confines the flow of trade to the two countries signing the agreement. Frequently the products exchanged are specified by Germany.

Germany keeps her accounts in blocked or compensation marks which are credited to the Latin American countries with which agreements are made. These marks have no value except for the purchase of goods from Germany. On the other hand, the system followed by Secretary Hull extends all trading privileges and trade concessions made to one country to all other countries as well.

The authority to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements was granted to the President and the State Department by the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. The Act was renewed in 1937, and again in 1940, for three year periods.

The principle upon which the Trade Agreements Act is based is not complex. It is simply a Congressional authorization under which the President and the State Department may negotiate trade agreements with other nations, and put these agreements into effect, without having them ratified by the Senate as is usually done in the case of treaties.

A trade agreement may reduce our tariffs on things the other negotiating country wants to sell us in return for a reduction of the other country's tariffs on certain things we want to sell it. It provides that both we and the country with which we make an agreement will extend all concessions we make to one another to all other nations with whom we have most-favored-nation agreements. That is, briefly, to treat all nations alike. The maximum that the President and State Department may reduce our tariff rates through these agreements is fifty per cent.

Such agreements have been signed and are in operation between the United States and eleven Latin American countries. These are Cuba, Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Ecuador, Costa Rica, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Venezuela. Our trade with trade agreement countries is increasing more rapidly than with non-agreement countries.

Venezuela was the last country to enter into a trading agreement. So far, negotiations with Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay, have been unsuccessful. Venezuela made several important concessions on the admittance of items from the United States representing 36 per cent of our total exports to that country. Such articles as iron and steel manufactures, lumber, wheat flour, certain types of furniture, and hog lard, were included. In 1938, the United States supplied Venezuela with 56 per cent of her imports; Germany 11 per cent; and Great Britain seven per cent.

The United States, in turn, reduced the import tax on crude petroleum

from Venezuela. This new rate of one-quarter cent a gallon, instead of one-half cent a gallon, now applies also to other oil producing countries, as Colombia and Mexico. The agreement specifies that the reduced rate applies only as the total imports from all countries do not exceed five per cent of the crude petroleum processed in American refineries. While this provision allows more crude petroleum to enter the country than previously, it also provides a definite protection for our own producers.

Inter-American commercial policies outside the reciprocal trading agreements have been manifest in the establishment of exchange controls, import licenses and tariffs.

The Eighth International Conference of American States held at Lima, Peru, in December, 1938, adopted a resolution favoring measures to promote the greatest possible volume of mutually profitable trade. The resolution reaffirmed the declarations, agreed upon at the Montevideo and Buenos Aires Conferences, calling upon the American governments to reduce to the greatest extent possible "all existing types of restrictions, embodying the principle of equality of treatment as the most beneficial and effective method of extending and facilitating international trade."

The Havana Conference, like the Panama Conference before it, declared that today it is more necessary than ever to have inter-American cooperation, in order that these governments "may protect their economic and financial structure, maintain their fiscal equilibrium, safeguard the stability of their currency, promote and expand their industries, intensify their agriculture, and develop their commerce."

War conditions in Europe and in the Far East have interfered with our regular trade channels, cutting us off from normal markets for our exports and sources of important raw materials. The same world problems have depressed Latin American exports. A broad program of economic cooperation between the United States and Latin America and among the Latin American countries themselves is thought to be essential.

Increases in our exports to Latin American countries are necessarily contingent upon increased imports from these countries. Additional credit facilities, the development of new materials and resources, and possible use of our gold reserves in stabilizing their currencies, have been suggested by trade experts. The Export-Import Bank has been enlarging its activities to extend longer credits to Latin American merchants, cushioning the shock of releasing more exchange for payments to North American creditors.

More agreements, as the one with Brazil, to furnish experts to study the development of natural resources and new uses of available raw materials are being planned. In addition, a long-time program of public education in the meaning of foreign trade, and hemisphere interdependence would be helpful.

While the United States and her southern neighbors enjoy a complementary economic situation, to a considerable degree, there are certain important common products and exports which compete upon the world market and which each would like to sell to the other. It has been one purpose of the Trade Agreements Program to ameliorate these problems.

Oklahoma, Texas and Louisiana oil have to compete with petroleum produced in Venezuela, Colombia, and Mexico; our cotton competes with Brazilian cotton; our tobacco with that grown in Cuba; our wheat, mutton, and beef, with that of Argentina and Uruguay. These are the more conspicuous examples.

Fortunately, exports from the two regions are mainly complementary and do not conflict with each other. Coffee, cane sugar, cocoa, bananas, carnauba wax, linseed and other oilseeds, certain woods, tin, manganese, and other products, must be imported into the United States. These are exchanged for our exports of iron and steel manufacturers, heavy machinery, cotton textiles, fuels, automotive vehicles, and other things.

We might turn to Latin America for certain products now being bought from non-American countries. Rubber and manganese can be developed and obtained in Brazil; tungsten and tin in Bolivia; mercury in Mexico; mica in Argentina; and manila hemp in most of the Central American countries. We might also turn from the East Indies to Ecuador and Brazil for our supplies of quinine and cassava. Many of these products, of course, would have to be developed over a period of years before the supply would be sufficient for our needs.

Actually, the rubber industry in the Netherlands East Indies and British Malaya was started with the native rubber plant of Brazil, smuggled out by enterprising Dutchmen and Englishmen. Our own businessmen encouraged the development of the industry in both British and Dutch holdings. Many of them established plantations in these remote colonies. Consequently, we turned to the East Indies and to British Malaya for our rubber and the possibilities for development in Brazil have been largely ignored.

The British took the Cincona tree from Ecuador, transplanted it in Java and today the United States, world's largest consumer of quinine, buys practically all it needs from that source.

Every year we buy several million dollars worth of coffee from the East Indies. We even refer to our morning cup as "Java." Yet the coffee we buy from Java is actually of Brazilian origin, the South American plant having largely replaced the native East Indian variety.

Cassava or Manioc is another Brazilian plant that the British and Dutch have transplanted in the Far East. The United States uses something like $20,000,000 worth of this product each year. Manioc has several uses. It is used for mucilage, as on the back of postage stamps; for food, as tapioca pudding; for starch; and for the dextrine and glucose it yields. Brazilian farmers are planting large acreages this year in anticipation of an increased market in the United States.

But even with these shifts and adjustments, Latin America still produces something like one billion dollars worth of goods each year which must be exported. Large supplies of wheat, corn, cotton, petroleum, copper, and meat, normally sold in Europe, could not be consumed in the United States because we have our own surpluses of these things.

In 1938, the United States consumed only five per cent of Latin Ameri-

ca's meat; eight per cent of its wool; two per cent of its cotton; two per cent of its tin; no wheat, corn, or copper; and very little oil.

The United States has been buying most of its tin from non-American sources. Ten per cent of its tin, however, has been going from Bolivia to England, there mixed with better grade Nigerian ore, smelted, and shipped to the United States. None is smelted in this country.

Meat, the second most important food export of Latin America, has a very small market in the United States. Most comes from Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay, as canned corned beef. The bulk, however, 74 per cent, is shipped to Great Britain in the form of chilled beef and mutton. Fresh beef cannot be admitted into the United States from Argentina because of government restrictions related to the hoof and mouth disease. The meat production of the United States is ten times as great as the total meat exports of Latin America.

Coffee, the most important tropical product, has been held off the world market in large quantities. In 1938, we took 58 per cent of Latin America's exports of coffee. This left a surplus valued at $95,000,000 to be sold abroad.

The Caribbean area includes 12 of the 20 Latin American Republics. These are definitely within the political and economic orbit of the United States. They realize that their economic destiny is linked with ours since we provide their chief market and also exercise a strong financial influence.

The eight remaining countries—all of independent South America except Colombia and Venezuela—are in a different category. Trade ties with the United States have not been as close. The surplus commodity problem, except for petroleum, is largely concentrated in this bloc of countries which, in 1938, accounted for 58 per cent of all Latin American exports. If there is to be a real united front of the Americas these nations, especially Argentina, Brazil, and Chile must be convinced that the United States is prepared to offer more than Germany in the interests of their material welfare.

We must, of course, be prepared to make any necessary adjustment in our trade program, or to adopt any supplementary measures, which conditions in a chaotic world may require. Such a realistic approach, however, need not obscure the importance of taking now whatever action is possible to preserve and strengthen the principles of liberal trade.

INTER-AMERICAN POLITICAL RELATIONS

DR. WILLIAM W. PIERSON, *Dean of the Graduate School, and Head of the Department of Political Science, University of North Carolina*

For this Bulletin which includes such topics as the meaning of Pan Americanism, cultural relations of the American peoples, and economic relations, I have been asked to deal with the subject of inter-American political relations. I do not, in attempting to discuss this theme, wish to be thought of as holding that these political relations are the most important. I do believe that when political misunderstanding obtains between peoples all of the other relations are likely to be embittered. As we commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Pan American Union, it is with satisfaction and elevation of spirit that we can say that the political relations of American states were never in better condition and conception. There is the prospect that political problems and issues are being placed in the way of intelligent resolution and that principles have been formulated and accepted which may be permanent bases of common policy.

These political relations include not only those of the half century of the Pan American Union but those of seventy years more, dating from the initiation of the Spanish-American wars of independence in 1810 and from the time of the formal recognition of that independence by the United States in 1822. Expressions of friendship, of awareness of a common institutional destiny, of a common interest in defense against outside aggression and interference, of ties that bind and of differences that separate—are all and severally to be found in the history of these relationships.

If we should attempt to set ourselves the problem of selecting the most important of these political relations, leaving out special national interests, I believe our choices would include the following:

1. The problem of recognition.
2. The Monroe Doctrine as a factor in inter-American relations and international relations of the Americas.
3. Territorial expansion of American countries.
4. Policies and practices of regulation or headship in the Western Hemisphere.
5. Pan Americanism.
6. Good neighbor policies.

Some of these relations may be thought of as factors that, having started, have continued in one or another form as constants; whereas others are regarded as having run their courses and ceased to be influential. We are not now concerned as to whether or not the latter opinion may be wishful thinking. Time wrought many changes in these policies, changes that on occasion amounted to virtual contradiction. Some American states, despite these alterations in policy, have returned to first principles. An example is afforded by the problem of recognition. In the beginning, the choice was between the *de jure* and the *de facto* principles—that is as to whether we should recognize changes in government or in statehood on the grounds that the new government or new state represented popular will

and showed evidence of stability and willingness to discharge international obligations or that we should decide recognition on grounds of legality and rightfulness in accordance with our opinions of legality and rightfulness. In the course of time, the United States and several other American states have reversed positions in this matter. However that may be, all students of this subject know that recognition or the withholding or withdrawal of recognition is a powerful instrument of interference when employed by a strong state. Some of us think that one of the most hopeful developments of recent times is the return to the first principles of self-determination and non-interference.

A different sort of example is that of territorial expansion or political imperialism. The United States, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Mexico, Guatemala, Haiti, Colombia, Peru, and Bolivia have engaged in this sort of activity, with or without declared war as a medium. Whatever the degree of success attained by individual states in this type of endeaver and whatever the extenuations and patriotic defenses that may be offered, it is hoped that this crasser form of imperialism is ended and that the fears engendered and the predictions inspired may be set at rest forever.

No more interesting factor in inter-American relations can be found than that of headship or international regulation. Several states have essayed this role. There is the long standing case of Argentine-Brazilian rivalry for headship of the Platine region; again there is the interference of Chile in the attempted Peru-Bolivian confederation; and the relations of Mexico to Central America. Only the United States has asserted an overall headship in the name of paramount interest, power, and continental sovereignty. In the beginning, the United States, the oldest and most powerful of the American republics, was merely the strongest among several states nearly as strong. At the time of Monroe's famous message in 1823, it had a population of about ten million, while Mexico had six or seven. In later years, and after the Civil War, the disproportion in population, probable fighting strength, wealth, and reserve force was to be overwhelming, since in these respects the United States was to become more powerful than all the Latin American states combined. As this primacy in strength became indisputable, it was made manifest in a series of acts, such as the achievement of a canal—"an American canal on American soil" —armed interventions, the establishment of semi-protectorates, dollar diplomacy, supervision of elections, creation of a new state, the outlawing of revolutions, a new recognition policy,—in fine, the United States became a continental policeman. Many thought the United States with its surplus of energy, capital, and resources was responding to an inexorable law of imperialism; some even defended it on that ground.

One of the curiosities that must bewilder future historical students was that coincidental with this headship, there was launched Pan Americanism, inconsistent with it in every positive respect. Pan Americanism professed friendship, equality, integrity, peace, and cooperation. In this confusion of fears, suspicions, acts of predominance, professions and gestures of friendship, conflicting conceptions and definitions of the Monroe Doctrine, it was

difficult for the inter-American-minded person to grope his way. In this time of uncertainty, however, there were always some with suggestions of a more coherent and constructive program. The Good Neighbor policies were one by one urged before the time of President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, and their Latin-American associates. These policies have not, so far as I know, been officially defined; they have been evolved. Recently, in convention assembled at Nashville, Tennessee, the Southern Council on International Relations attempted a definition of these policies. It is as follows:

"ATTITUDES OF THE SOUTH

I. We believe that the South endorses the so-called "good neighbor policies. We think of these policies, the culmination of the efforts made over a long period of time of those entertaining certain ideals of inter-American relations, as one of the highest achievements of our times. In our own country, we especially commend and endorse the work of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull in the formulation and observance of these policies. They not only constitute idealism, but good sense and international fair dealing. We understand the "good neighbor" policies to mean:

1. No armed intervention by any American country in the affairs and territory of another.

2. A respect for the territorial integrity and political independence of every American state by every other and the abstinence from territorial expansion by force, whether in declared war or otherwise.

3. The recognition of the right of every American state in complete freedom to determine for itself its own form of government and its own way of selecting its officials. Formal "recognition" of changes in government will be according to the *de facto* principle—the traditional American principle of self-determination—and will be based on evidences of stability and of willingness to discharge international obligations.

4. The rights of aliens of whatever American state, both individual and corporate, within any American state will be respected as to person and as to legally owned property. Disputes will be settled according to law administered in the courts of the country in which the alleged injury to rights occurred or by some juridical or diplomatic process agreed upon by the states involved. We believe that each country has the full right to decide for itself the political, social, and legal issues involved in property tenure; but we believe that expropriation or nationalization of private property held by aliens should be subject to due process of law and should be accompanied by fair compensation. We believe this principle to be not only equitable to the public and private parties concerned, but to be one which in operation will contribute to the maintenance of international confidence and to the stability of credit.

5. The settlement of disputes between American states by peaceful means. We approve of the methods of arbitration, conciliation, mediation, and consultation—in fine, the uses of diplomacy rather than those of force.

6. The maintenance by the United States of America of the Monroe Doctrine, in that that country is obligated to prevent by all means at its

disposal the acquisition of territory in the Western Hemisphere by any non-American power and the political interference of any non-American power in the affairs of any American state.

7. In case of any threat to the peace of the Americas, we favor as provided by the Declaration of Lima and exemplified by the Declaration of Panama the consultation of the American states as to the measures to be taken in cooperation.

8. In case of such crisis, we favor, by reason of the resources and defense preparation of the United States, that loans, sales of arms, and provision of technical advice shall on favorable terms be made to associated Latin American states which may ask such services.

II. We endorse the Inter-American Committee on Neutrality, now holding conference at Rio de Janeiro; and the Inter-American Advisory Committee on Economic Affairs, now in session at Washington."

I wish to endorse this statement, in whole and in detail, and to express the hope that in the long future, as well as in the dangerous present, the principles as declared will guide and prevail in a determined effort to preserve the integrity and independence of the Western Hemisphere.

THE EIGHTH PAN AMERICAN CONFERENCE, LIMA, PERU, DECEMBER, 1938

BERNARD J. FLATOW

From December 9, to December 27, 1938, the Eighth International Conference of American States was in session at Lima, Peru.

The first conference of this type, held in Washington, D. C. from October 2, 1889 to April 19, 1890, was called to discuss problems such as the formation of a customs union, better communications, a common silver coin, a uniform system of weights and measures, patent and copyrights, trademarks, the sanitary regulation of ships and ports, and a plan for arbitration.

Since then, the scope of the topics discussed at these meetings has grown steadily, and in proportion to the growth of the spirit of Pan Americanism, so that it should not be surprising that at the Lima Conference, the eighth of its kind, such problems as a Declaration of Continental Solidarity and the establishment of a closely woven system of cultural cooperation dominated the proceedings.

Internal peace was no longer a problem at Lima. It had its climax at Buenos Aires, in 1936, and in the settlement of the dispute between Paraguay and Bolivia over the Grand Chaco, reached through a process of mediation, on July 21, 1938.

What was needed was a definition of position, and the basis for this was given in the opening address of the Conference by President Oscar Benevides of Peru, when he said, "The attitude of the American Republics, concerning world affairs, is one of collaboration, not of rebuke; and of help, not of reproach."

Prior to the assembling of the delegates at Lima, the newspapers of the various countries, especially the United States, had been emphasizing the theme of "continental solidarity," a topic which did not appear on the official agenda. Thus, in the New York Times of November 25, 1938, the following editorial was published:

> As our delegation sails for Lima, our neighbors to the South must be aware that we seek no authority which they will not share. We look to them as co-equal partners in the defense of the common interests of the Western World.

It is interesting to note the similarity of two editorials which appeared on the same day, December 4, 1938, in two different newspapers, in two different countries, in two different languages. The first is from Diario de Hoy, of San Salvador, El Salvador; the second, from the New York Times.

> In Munich, although the Peace of Europe was decided, they quartered a democratic country, while in Lima they will treat of peace in a nobler manner. Peace was achieved at Munich by a threat of war. In Lima, it will be consolidated by good judgment and harmony.

> We do not seek to impress these warm-hearted people with our might, or shout our virtues at them across empty oceans, but to win their regard by walking with them down the same pathways.

Thus, did the power of the press create in the minds of the American people and their delegates the idea of close cooperation and unanimity which dominated the conference and had its culmination in the Declaration of the Principles of the Solidarity of America (The Declaration of Lima) and the Declaration of American Principles, the two outstanding achievements of the sessions.

The problems which faced the Conference may be classified into two groups:

1. Those of a purely continental nature, concerning solely relations in and among the twenty-one American Republics, and,
2. Those emanating from the national and international practices and policies of the totalitarian nations which have an effect upon the American nations.

Questions such as the establishment of an Inter-American Court of International Justice, the perfection of the system of consultation, and the strengthening of cultural ties among the American nations, while no less important than those of the second group, were more easily solved and received far less publicity than the latter. This was only natural, considering the condition of world affairs prior to the opening of the sessions. There were, in fact, several attempts made to interpret the Conference primarily as a clash between totalitarianism and democracy, and thus, to divert it from its main purpose: the consideration of common inter-American problems. In response to these attempts, an editorial appeared in the New York Times on December 13, 1938, which expressed the actual *raison d'etre* of all Pan American Conferences.

> We ought not . . . to interpret Pan Americanism as anti-Europeanism. There is nothing irreconcilable in desiring at the same time a stronger defense of the two Americas and a closer tie with the democracies of Europe.

Such was the sentiment that surrounded the entire discussion of "continental solidarity".

There were two divergent opinions concerning this topic. The conservative group, led by the Argentine delegation, feared that a strong declaration might serve to alienate the European nations and Japan, upon whom many of the Latin American countries are dependent for markets for their products. Argentina, in particular, has much to lose as she is the chief supplier of wheat and meat products to the European markets. The liberal faction, composed of the Central American countries, the West Indies, Mexico, and the United States, favored a strong statement that would definitely express not only the antipathy of the Americas toward fascist expansion in the New World, but also the determination of the Western Hemisphere to maintain its unity and to guard the principles upon which that unity is based against any threat of fascist extension.

After thirteen days of intense discussion, innumerable committee meetings, and the usual number of pleonastic speeches, an equitable compromise was reached. What emerged was a vigorous declaration—The Declaration of Lima—which asserted that the people of America have attained "spiritual unity" through the similarity of their institutions, their desire for peace, the equal sovereignty of their states, their adherence to the principles of the Law of Nations and of individual liberty without religious or racial prejudices, and their intention of preserving those principles against "all foreign intervention or activity that may threaten them." It also stated that in case the "peace, security, or territorial integrity of any American Republic is threatened, they consider it the concern of all of them, and are determined to make their solidarity effective by co-ordinating the sovereign will of each by the procedure of consultation." [1] (a meeting of consultation may be called by any one of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics) Thus, a settlement was reached that was agreeable to all concerned. There was neither victor nor vanquished.

An example of the general reaction to the accord may be seen in an editorial comment of a Cuban newspaper,

> It was the strongest step ever taken by Pan American nations to bind themselves together . . . taken in the shadow of influences from Europe and Asia which many regard as incipient threats to their independence. [2]

Closely associated with the Declaration of American Solidarity are two momentous resolutions that supplement and intensify it. The first, which denounces and condemns all racial and religious bigotry and intolerance in all parts of the world, is of indescribable significance, since it has appeared at a time when minority persecutions have reached their zenith point in modern history. The resolution declares that any persecution on account of racial or religious motives, which makes it impossible for a group of human beings to live decently, is contrary to the political and juridical systems of America. It also maintains that the democratic conception of a state guarantees to all individuals the conditions essential for carrying on their legitimate activities with self-respect, and that the Republics of America will always apply these principles of "human solidarity".

Such a resolution is more unifying than any declaration of solidarity would dare to be, and if it is rigidly enforced, the tradition of America being a land of salvation for all who are oppressed will become an irrefutable reality.

An editorial which appeared in the leading newspaper of Bogotá, capital of Colombia, before the opening of the Conference, stressed this idea emphatically by declaring,

> If (American) unity exists, European civilization and culture, in their most accomplished and dexterous elements, will find refuge in America, because of being threatened in another part of the world. [3]

---

[1] *Report on the Results of the Eighth International Conference of American States*, p. 93.
[2] *The Havana Post*, Havana, Cuba, December 25, 1938.
[3] *El Tiempo*, Bogotá, Colombia, December 5, 1938.

The second of these resolutions condemns the collective political activities of groups of aliens residing in this hemisphere. It plainly states that foreigners living in any of the American nations cannot collectively claim the status of minorities, for the conditions which characterize minority groups do not exist in this hemisphere. However, individually they may continue to enjoy the rights to which they are entitled.

This project, presented by the Brazilian delegation, was undoubtedly intended as a warning to the numerous colonies of Germans, Italians, and Japanese which are found throughout South America, that they may expect no special privileges because of their number or national origin. Most notable among these settlements are the million or more Germans in Brazil who live mainly in the State of Rio Grande do Sul and sponsor numerous Nazi organizations which are affiliated with similar bodies in the fatherland, and the Italian groups in Uruguay and Argentina. While not of very great importance, at present, to some of the nations of the West Indies and North America, which are not faced directly with such problems, this definition of American position in regard to the political organization of foreign minorities gives the countries which have such problems a basis for action other than national policy, and lends to them the moral strength of the other American Republics.

The "aggressive" desire of the Western Hemisphere for peace and good will among all nations is clearly illustrated by the granting of individual rights to all aliens, in spite of the fact that several of the countries from which many of these aliens come refuse the same rights to citizens of American nations within their jurisdiction.

Another prominent and noteworthy act of the sessions was the agreement upon, and the codification of, the basic rules of conduct and action that bind together and guide the peoples of these two continents. These common beliefs are embodied in a resolution termed "The Declaration of American Principles." In it, the American Republics have declared themselves interested in the preservation of world order under law, peace, and justice, and in the social and economic welfare of all mankind. In order to achieve those objectives, they consider the following principles "essential".

1. Non-intervention by one state in the internal or external affairs of another.
2. The peaceful settlement of all disputes.
3. The abolition of force as an instrument of national or international policy.
4. International relations based upon international law.
5. The faithful observance of treaties.
6. Intellectual and cultural cooperation.
7. Economic cooperation.
8. International cooperation, in order to carry out all of the above mentioned principles.

The intrinsic value of this declaration lies in the fact that each of the signatory nations has stated in simple language those rules of international conduct which they propose to follow. Such a declaration is of in-

estimable value toward the furthering of peaceful relations among all nations. One need only consider the present situation in Europe, which is due primarily to a failure or disinclination of each of those countries to define their position, in order to fully realize and appreciate the contribution of such a declaration to the cause of international harmony. The basis of most misunderstanding is the failure of the parties to define their "terms". The American nations, who have come to realize this fact, have indicated their desire to reduce international misunderstanding to a minimum by adopting this accord.

A statement made by Senator Henry Berenger, President of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the French Senate, on the eve of the Conference, is a conclusive example of the fact that certain European groups recognize the inevitable trend of Western Hemisphere action. Said he:

> We in Europe would make a great error in believing that there is a basic conflict of any sort between the Latin and Anglo-Saxon Americans. Naturally, there are temporary . . . misunderstandings. The total absence of such would be . . . unnatural. The aim of all Pan American conferences is to solve precisely such difficulties, a fact which Europe must never exaggerate, if she wishes to understand American evolution fully and reasonably. American evolution continues toward a goal of American federalism covering economic, social, and political questions, and is now developing during its early maturity into one of the most powerful families of future humanity.[4]

Undoubtedly, the heaviest burden of the Conference fell upon the Committee for the Organization of Peace, of which Dr. Afranio de Mello Franco, Brazil's veteran statesman and head of his country's delegation to the Conference, was elected Chairman.

The resolution that was ultimately adopted provided for the extension of consultation "on the initiative of one or more Governments and with the previous agreement of the others, to any economic, cultural, or other question which, by reason of its importance, justifies the procedure, and in the examination or solution of which the American States may have a common interest."

The improvement of this act upon the one passed at Buenos Aires lies in the fact that it extends the system of consultation to all questions of "common interest," whereas, the action taken at Buenos Aires provided for consultation only in cases in which the peace of the continents was threatened.

The juridical measures to prevent war in America are scattered in numerous treaties, conventions, pacts, and declarations which it is necessary to coordinate into an organized and unified instrument. Accordingly, a plan was presented by the United States delegation through which there would be built up a pacific solution of differences between American States

[4] *The Panama American*, Panama City, Panama, December 9, 1938.

by consolidating in a single instrument all the regulations contained in the eight treaties now in force.

The Committee, considering the complexity of the problem, proposed a resolution that referred all of the peace proposals to the Pan American Union, in order that that body might classify, and then transmit them to each of the American Governments, requesting their opinions and proposals which may serve as a basis for their codification and condensation into a single pact. It also requested that the Governments forward their suggestions to the Union, and that the Union, in turn, send all of the replies, together with all of the projects presented at the Eighth International Conference of American States, to the International Conference of American Jurists which will undertake the definitive work of the Peace Code. And lastly, it requested that the International Conference of American Jurists render a detailed report, regarding the status of their labors in this matter, to the Ninth International Conference of American States which is scheduled to be held in Bogotá, Colombia, in 1943.

For many years the topic of the creation of an Inter-American Court of International Justice has aroused a great deal of controversial discussion, and for several months preceding the Conference the newspapers devoted a sizeable amount of their editorial space to this question. Opinion at the Conference was divided among three groups. There were some who felt that, for the time being, all efforts should be limited to recommending improvements in the organization of the Permanent Court of International Justice at the Hague. Others wanted an Inter-American Court, but only with the participation of all the states of the hemisphere, and the representation of all juridical systems. There were a few who favored the establishment of an Inter-American Court with an appreciable number of the States for a nucleus. However, the prevailing sentiment favored the second alternative, and as the delegations were not prepared to subscribe to such an agreement, the Conference limited itself to the adoption of a declaration which expressed the purpose of the American nations to establish an Inter-American Court whenever they recognize the possibility of doing so with complete assurance of success.

Their decision was another example of the application of the policy of unanimous conclusions, instead of mere majority opinions, inaugurated by Mr. Hull, the United States Secretary of State.

Proof of the fact that the American nations recognize culture as the strongest link that binds them together in a peaceful union are the thirty-six resolutions which deal with the general subject of cultural and intellectual cooperation. The encouragement and development of mutual understanding and good will depend upon the ease and speed with which cultural and other information is disseminated. To this end, a resolution was passed which urged those American Governments which have not already organized National Committees of Intellectual Cooperation, to do so. At present, thirteen of the countries have such committees. The chief duty of these groups is to publicize in their respective countries, in every possible way, the treaties, conventions, resolutions, and recommendations that have

been adopted and may be adopted in the future by International Conferences of American States.

Another proposal advocated the calling of conferences of a technical character in order to facilitate the work of the regular Pan American conferences and to allow them to give their undivided attention to questions concerning the maintenance of peace, and general relations among the American Republics.

Several conferences devoted to specialized subjects have been held and have proved highly productive.

There have been ten Pan American Sanitary Conferences, up to date. The last one, which was held at Bogotá, Colombia, in September, 1938, was the most successful one ever held. Its main accomplishment was the extension of the activities of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau to cover the fiields of sanitary engineering, maritime and aerial sanitation, nutrition, and infectious, occupational, and venereal diseases; subjects which in the past, have been completely ignored in some of the Latin American countries. Eight Pan American Scientific Congresses have been held.

The first Pan American Conference of Municipalities took place in Havana, Cuba, in 1938.

These special conferences will permit the very specialized subjects to receive the expert consideration of men and women who are experienced in the various fields, and thus, much more will probably be accomplished than under the system that has been followed, of treating these subjects at the regular Pan American conferences. The expenses of these extra gatherings, which are considerable, are sure to be offset by the progress made in the special fields by the intensely coordinated work of experts.

It has also been proposed that the time between regular Pan American conferences be reduced from the usual five years, and that each of the Governments establish National Pan American Committees to cooperate with the Pan American Union in receiving, classifying, and distributing information among the social, labor, commercial, and cultural organizations of all the countries; in making studies of local character; and in preparing and distributing statistical and informative analyses of their separate governments.

Another resolution urged that the Pan American Union, as well as other Pan American organizations, cooperate with any international body that is interested in establishing peaceful relations among all nations.

In back of all these proposals, there is but one purpose, the creation of a "will for peace," for America realizes that not only her own peace, but that of the entire world, rests upon the desire for peace and opposition toward all methods of force.

Believing that a better understanding of each other's problems will be greatly aided by actual contact with those problems, the delegates adopted four resolutions that are intended to give an impetus to inter-American travel. They urged the Governments to reduce or eliminate, if possible, all existing requirements which act as a barrier to increased tourist travel. They also advocated the establishment, by the Republics of Central America,

the West Indies, and North America, of federations similar to the South American Federation of Tourist Travel, in anticipation of a Pan American Confederation for Tourist Travel.

To inspire teachers and students to travel within the Hemisphere during their vacations, it was suggested that each country establish "vacation courses" in the languages, literature, political economy, and social sciences, designed primarily to make available to foreign scholars on vacation, a knowledge of the past and present cultures of the various American States.

Another resolution urged that "those nations which have not yet ratified the Convention on the Pan American Highway, signed at Buenos Aires, on December 23, 1936, (which provides for the speedy completion of a Pan American Highway uniting all the countries of the Hemisphere) study the project with a view to its early ratification." A section of this proposal advocates the study of the suggestion, made by the Cuban delegation, of the extension of the Pan American Highway to the insular republics of America by means of ferryboats.

Several of the countries, notably Mexico, Peru, and Nicaragua, have already completed large portions of the road. The United States has contributed one million dollars to build one hundred and seventy-three bridges along the Highway in Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama; and two hundred and fifty thousand dollars in order to complete the necessary investigation concerning the route to be followed in South America.[5]

There are also plans for a Pan American Railway, and a Permanent Committee of the Pan American Railway is now functioning under the leadership of Engineer Juan A. Briano, who submitted an extensive report, on the progress made by his committee, to the Conference.

Several resolutions approved by the Conference reflect the important part that is played by educational institutions in this great campaign of cultural and intellectual cooperation and exchange. One of them, introduced by the United States delegation, provides that each nation exert an effort to adopt the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations, (signed at Buenos Aires, on December 23, 1936) which provides for an annual award, by each of the contracting governments, of two fellowships to graduate students and teachers from each of the other signatory nations, and also for the exchange of a professor from each country who would lecture, conduct classes, or do research in some institution, and who should work in all appropriate ways to promote better understanding, friendship, and good will between the cooperating nations. A provision was also included to encourage the establishment of endowments, fellowships, and scholarships by private and official agencies.

Another proposal urged the countries, "insofar as it may be conformable with their educational systems," to include in the curricula of their institutions of learning courses in the study of Spanish, English, Portuguese, and French; the languages of America. The countries were also asked to grant

[5] *El Eco*, New York City, N. Y., March 1, 1939.

mutual recognition of degrees from institutions of higher learning, and to give credit for courses that are comparable to their own, taken in other American countries.

A broad program of exchange between the libraries of the various countries, based upon projects presented by the Argentine and Bolivian Delegations, was advocated by the Conference. A reminder was given to the countries of their obligation to deposit a copy of all works, published under their jurisdiction, with the Columbus Memorial Library of the Pan American Union, and a provision was made for the creation of a permanent bureau in each country to handle the interchange of social legislation and publications relating to its application. It was also recommended that all books and magazines, prints, engravings, and maps, except those prohibited by law, be permitted to enter free of duty, into all of the countries.

As another means of strengthening the existing ties between the American nations, the Conference requested that the Pan American Union study the possibility of establishing a bureau for the exchange and distribution of the musical compositions of American composers and to promote cooperative relations between the musical organizations of all the countries.

Several other resolutions providing for the use of the radio in disseminating inter-American cultural information, cooperation among the scientific institutions of America, the establishment of an American Culture Day, an inter-American contest to select a hymn of peace, and the holding of cultural ceremonies concurrently with future Pan American Conferences, all aid in rounding out one of the most extensive programs ever undertaken to create better understanding among nations.

Much progress has already been made in this field by the Carnegie Institution, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Guggenheim Foundation, the Institute of International Education, the Pan American Bibliographic and Library Association, the Inter-American Federation of Education, the Good Neighbor Forum, the Pan American Medical Association, the Pan American Odontological Association, the Committee of Cooperation in Latin America, the Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America, and many other private organizations (e.g., Pan American Airways, W. R. Grace & Co.).

The comprehensive program adopted by the Eighth International Conference of American States will greatly assist these groups in extending their campaigns of friendship and peace, the ultimate foundations of an inter-American order.

The most difficult problems of all inter-American conferences have always been those relating to hemispherical economic and financial cooperation. This is not without just reason. The former policies employed by the businessmen of the "Colossus of the North" in Latin America and the traditional Latin fear of such figures of speech as "Big Stick," "Dollar Diplomacy," and "Yankee Imperialism" have been big factors in retarding inter-American economic *rapprochement.* The disproportionateness of the economic systems of Latin and Anglo-Saxon America has been the greatest hinderance to all efforts of reconciliation. The United States, a creditor

nation, with her enormous world-wide trade and her advanced, complex financial organization, and the twenty debtor nations of Latin America with their vast, untouched natural resources and their financial systems which, in almost all cases, are still in the colonial stage, have long appeared to be two irreconcilable forces. To add further complexity to the problems, the artificial and barter trade policies, recently inaugurated by Germany, Italy, and Japan, have provided keen competition to countries, such as the United States and Great Britain, who prefer to maintain the conventional cash payment system of exchange.

At Lima, an effort was made to discuss the economic relations between the Americas in the light of present-day realities, rather than with idealistic adjectives; in the light of reason, rather than emotion; in the light of good business and facts, rather than tradition and catch-phrases.

The theme of the discussions on this topic was the reduction of all barriers to international trade. Equality of treatment for all was proposed by the drafting of multi-lateral trade agreements.

Through two other measures was it attempted to coördinate and improve the economic status of the Hemisphere. The first, requested that the Pan American Union consider the advisability of organizing an Inter-American Institute of Economics and Finance to foster a broad and comprehensive program of cooperation in virtually every field of economic and financial endeavor. This resolution is an outgrowth of several of a similar nature that were presented to the Seventh International Conference of American States and to the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace.

The second of these projects provides for periodic informal meetings of the Treasury representatives of the various nations, to be held at least annually and whenever problems of special importance arise. The first of these sessions was held in Guatemala, in 1939.

These acts, seemingly unimportant because of the lack of a definite program, are part of the foundation that is being laid for this top-heavy program of "hemispherical communalism". Definite action cannot be expected to emerge spontaneously from any of these conferences. The will to cooperate, which is the basis of definite action, first shows itself through readiness to discuss. The first sign of cooperation is the willingness to concede.

Definite action will not become a reality until the Latin American countries are liberated from their present status of vassals to European and Japanese artificial trade policies. The key to definite and concrete cooperative action is in Uncle Sam's pocket. When he uses it to open the gates of his high tariff walls, the dilapidated machinery of Western Hemispherical economic progress will again function under the power of the greatest possible volume of mutually profitable international trade.

The attainment of such a volume of trade is hindered by unreasonably high tariffs, the faulty administration of commercial, monetary, and exchange policies, which makes complete equality of opportunity among sup-

pliers impossible, and by exchange controls, quotas, licenses, and other types of quantitative impedimenta.

The ultimate results of all these restrictions is the creation of grave unemployment problems, the obstruction of the fulfillment of broad social programs, the limitation of opportunities for economic advancement, and the lowering of present standards of living. They also tend to direct trade into uneconomic channels (i.e., barter systems and exchange based upon depreciated currency) and to create international hard feelings.

One topic which was not on the agenda, but the discussion of which proved unavoidable, was a criticism of totalitarianism. Several attempts were made to interpret the Conference as primarily a question of democracy versus autocracy.

Prior to the opening of the Conference, Dr. Francisco Tudela, head of the Peruvian delegation to the League of Nations, declared, "The Lima Conference will be an imposing display of continental solidarity against the totalitarian governments of the Old World."

In a speech before the Conference, on December 16, 1938, Dr. Francisco Castillo-Nájera, President of the Mexican delegation to the Conference and Ambassador of his country to the United States, supported the Peruvian Diplomat's remark by saying,

> A careful examination of the material submitted to the Committees and Subcommittees of the Conference shows that Dr. Tudela is in the right. More than a proposal, it is a reprobation of the anti-democratic and inhuman procedure in which the governments referred to by the Peruvian Statesman exult. [6]

In a milder sense, both Cordell Hull, the United States Secretary of State, and José María Cantilo, Foreign Minister of Argentina, declared that totalitarian theories of racial superiority and class differences are unadaptable to the Americas. However, neither of them advocated the promulgation of an American policy on the subject. They maintained that each country ought to determine its own policy. "Continental Solidarity", but individual policy was the theme of both speeches. [7]

More acute, and unusually blunt, was the attack upon dictatorships made by Dantes Bellegarde, of Haiti. Renowned for his ability as an orator, especially for his speeches before the Assembly of the League of Nations, M. Bellegarde, who spoke in French, said that the Americas could not possibly have anything in common with a nation that had reverted to customs of the Middle Ages, and had "set man against man, race against race, and class against class".

His remarks were obviously aimed at the Nazi regime in Germany. Precise direction was given to the implication by the action of five German correspondents who left the Chamber in a very ostentatious manner. [8]

Although these charges were well directed, it is very difficult to conceive theories of racial superiority gaining a strong foothold in America,

---

[6] *The West Coast Leader*, Lima, Peru, December 20, 1938.
[7] *The New York Times*, December 11, 1938.
[8] *The New York Times*, December 14, 1938.

whose strength, like a good alloy, lies in the diversity of her component masses.

A glance at the population figures available shows the Western Hemisphere to be such a "melting pot" that theories of racial superiority are reduced to an innocuous absurdity.

Mestizo	38,000,000
Creole (white)	25,000,000
White (in U. S. A.)	95,497,000
Negro (in Latin America)	15,000,000
Negro (in U. S. A.)	11,891,143
Mulatto and Zambo	25,000,000
Indians (in Latin America)	17,000,000
Indians (in U. S. A.)	332,397 [9]

In regard to the non-recognition of the acquisition of territory by force, a resolution was adopted which coordinated the eight similar declarations, signed since 1826. As this has now become a well-established principle of inter-American juridical relations, the Conference limited itself to the adoption of a resolution which reiterated, "as a fundamental principle of Public Law in America," that the acquisition or occupation of territory or any other modification, territorial or boundary arrangement, obtained by non-pacific means would not be valid, nor have legal effect. A clause was also included which proclaimed, "The pledge of non-recognition of situations arising from the foregoing conditions is an obligation which cannot be avoided either unilaterally or collectively."

As a climax to these rather broad and sweeping protestations of an inter-American order based upon international law, equality for all, mutual respect, and the peaceful manipulation of disputes, a resolution was passed in defense of human rights.

It is contended that because of the pacific and harmonious existence of the American nations, and their conception of international relations, it was, of course, unnecessary to discuss such a topic as the adoption of rules of warfare. But, it maintained, America cannot be indifferent, from a humane point of view, to the sufferings caused by war, and to the desire to diminish them. Therefore, they resolved that the American Republics, which do not recognize war as a legitimate means of settling national or international controversies, expressed the hope that when recourse is had to war in any other region in the world, respect be given to those human rights not necessarily involved in the conflict, to humanitarian sentiments, and to the spiritual and material inheritance of civilization.

This was, indeed, a fitting conclusion to the many other efforts to establish America as a land where the value of the individual is recognized, and his rights are guaranteed by the insurance of peace.

In summation, and in answer to the question, asked by many, "What did the Conference do toward establishing a permanent peace in America?" it is necessary to state jointly and concisely the accomplishments of the Con-

[9] Carleton Beals. *America South*, p. 53.

ference. These may be divided into two groups: general results of the Conference, and trends illustrated by the Conference.

In thirteen working-days, one hundred and ten resolutions, recommendations, and declarations were approved, but not one treaty or convention was signed. The latter fact is indicative of the desire of the nations to condense and improve the existing treaties and conventions already in force, before entering into others. Many people, without due deliberation, charge that each successive Pan American conference has complicated inter-American relations, and that the Lima Conference was no exception. It is difficult to determine the basis for this criticism when one considers that especial efforts were made to avoid unnecessary detail, at this Conference (e.g., no treaties or conventions of any kind were signed). But, the necessary answer is that only because of the existence of complications has simplification ever been known to come about. This, of course, does not mean that the more complicated we make our conferences the better chance we have of ultimately achieving our goal. It merely defends the opinion that only by investigation and study of each situation, from its origin up to, and including, its results, will we ever be able to arrive at any mutually satisfactory solution.

Mr. Hull's policy of unanimous decisions, instead of merely a majority, has led to fewer accomplishments per conference, but those agreements made have a far greater significance and are more binding than any of simply a majority nature.

The general results of the sessions may be stated as follows:

1. The Declaration of Continental Solidarity should bind the nations of the Western Hemisphere closer together and serve as a warning to the totalitarian governments of the Old World that their aggression will not be tolerated on this side of the Atlantic. The manpower united behind this Declaration ought to outlaw war forever from the Western Hemisphere.
2. The resolutions for the reduction of trade barriers and removal of commercial obstructions should encourage trade to move more freely among those countries that advocate liberal principles in commerce, and to discourage the use of barter systems and other artificial methods, now employed by the totalitarian states. Broadly speaking, they should become the basis for hemispherical economic reconstruction.
3. The fact that no treaties or conventions were signed ought to strengthen those already in force.
4. Continued adherence of the American nations to the basic principles of the Law of Nations is assured by the Declaration of American Principles.
5. The outlawing of force as an instrument of national or international policy ought to encourage other nations to

study the advisability of such a measure and, eventually, lead to its inevitable adoption.

6. The recognition of the equality and sovereignty of each, in addition to the Convention signed at Buenos Aires, in 1936, should insure each nation against interference from without, either in its internal or external affairs.

The value of these accomplishments were summed up by Mr. Hull, the United States Secretary of State, when he said,

> The principles of conduct which we have adopted and are carrying out in our relationships with each other are equally open as a basis of relationship with all other nations. It cannot be fairly said that we are trying to shut ourselves off in a hemisphere of our own; any such effort would be futile. But, it can be fairly said that the principles of conduct upon which the countries of this hemisphere have chosen to stand firm are so broad and essential that all the world may also stand upon them.[10]

Besides these generic results, the Conference clearly illustrated several important continental and world-wide trends which deserve to be mentioned.

The repugnance and distrust inspired in most Latin American countries by the unethical and bigoted methods of European dictatorships was to be noted more in the speeches of the various delegates than in the actual resolutions adopted. The reluctance of the Latin American nations to do anything that would definitely place them in opposition to the totalitarian states, as long as they are partially dependent upon them economically, was unmistakable. (This is the strongest argument in favor of inter-American economic cooperation, and for the reduction of United States tariffs).

The Declaration of Continental Solidarity substantiated the acceptance of the theory that a threat to one is a threat to all, and the intention of the American Republics to defend the Western Hemisphere from Old-World reaction.

The strong feeling against racial and religious persecution was evident both in the speeches of all of the delegates and in the resolution finally adopted condemning such practices.

The adoption of the resolution declaring that no minority rights shall be granted to any group of aliens in any of the countries, is sufficient proof of the determination of the Americas that they do not intend to have any American Czechoslovakias, and that no "Sudeten" question shall be raised around the large colonies of Germans in Brazil and Chile, or the Italians in Argentina and Uruguay.

Finally, and most important of all, the Latin American nations have been convinced that the United States does not seek to dominate the American Hemisphere, but desires that the Latin countries attain their rightful independent position in all international relations, and this to them means

[10] Excerpt from speech made before the Conference on December 24, 1938.

more than any number of resolutions that could have been adopted; for equality and independence form the ideal basis of an inter-American order.

Mr. Hull expressed this same opinion when he said,

> The right of each country to manage its own affairs free from outside interference; the principles of sovereignty and of equality of states irrespective of size and strength; sincere respect for law and the pledged word as the foundation of an international order; friendly and cooperative effort to promote enduring peace; mutually advantageous economic intercourse based upon the rule of equal treatment; and mutually broadening and uplifting cultural relationships—all these are indispensable if the governments of the world are to fulfill the sacred trust involved in the task of planning and providing for the safety and welfare of their peoples.[11]

The means of peace are always determined by the situation that has to be met. At Lima, we faced a situation not of preserving internal peace, but of establishing international peace. We answered a fascist challenge of strength by a peaceful declaration of union, which is the basis of strength.

We showed our desire for peace by denouncing force, the instrument of war. "The acid test of peace is the willingness to abandon implements of war."[12] "There are no . . . differences that cannot be settled by good

The part played by the Eighth International Conference of American States in the great panorama of inter-American relations was concisely expressed in a statement made by Mr. Hull in his final address to the delegates, on December 24, 1939, when he said,

> First we became free, then we acknowledged ourselves equal; than we united in common friendship.

---

[11] Excerpt from speech made before the Council on Foreign Relations, New York City, February 25, 1937.

[12] Excerpt from speech by the Hon. Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State of the United States at Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C., March 6, 1939.

will and good sense."[13]

[13] Excerpt from editorial in *The South Pacific Mail*, Santiago, Chile, December 15, 1938.

THE FIRST CONSULTATIVE CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN FOREIGN MINISTERS, HELD AT PANAMA, SEPTEMBER, 1939.

BERNARD J. FLATOW

One of the most important resolutions passed upon at the Lima Conference provided for the extension of the system of consultation "on the initiative of one or more governments and with the previous agreement of the others, to any economic, cultural, or other question which, by reason of its importance, justifies the procedure, and in the examination or solution of which the American States may have a common interest."

Until that time inter-American consultations had been limited to questions involving the peace of the Western Hemisphere. Now, any problem in which the nations of the New World may have a "common interest" is sufficient reason for the calling of a consultative conference of the foreign ministers of the American republics or their representatives.

The Consultative Conference of American Foreign Ministers held at Panama in September, 1939 was the first meeting to be held under this new system. It was called primarily for the purpose of unifying the gains made at the Lima Conference and for establishing a political, economic, and military hemispherical defense as a shock absorber against the chaotic European situation. The growth of the war in Europe had become a peril to the peace and economic security of the Western Hemisphere.

The conferees faced three outstanding problems:

1. the contraband lists of England and Germany,
2. the difficulties encountered by merchantmen in the war,
3. the lack of ships with which to carry goods.

A fourth problem, not officially mentioned before the sessions began, was the creation of an area of primary defense around the hemisphere in order to keep the actual fighting away from these shores, and thus to reduce the possibility of "incidents" which might lead to involvement. Several delegations suggested such a plan. The underlying principles were the same in all cases, the only difference of opinion being in the width of the defense area. Some delegates believed a band fifty miles wide would be sufficient to assure the safety of the Americas, while others wanted to extend the distance to one thousand miles.

In the first speech of the plenary session Under-Secretary of State Sumner Welles, Head of the United States Delegation, promised the assistance of this country toward cushioning the war shock. He stated the position of the United States in a four-point program.

1. Continuance of expansion of inter-American shipping lines by the United States Maritime Commission to avoid loss of communications such as resulted in the First World War.
2. An increase in commerce among the Americas.
3. Financial aid in stabilizing American currencies.

4. Loans by the Export-Import Bank to help Latin American countries develop their own resources.

This program indicated not only a willingness to subscribe to isolation of the American seas, but concrete financial and economic assistance to Latin America. The promise to maintain and expand inter-American shipping facilities pleased the Latin delegates greatly. It appeared as a partial solution to one of the most pressing problems that confronts virtually all of the countries as a result of the war. The shipping services of the belligerents to both coasts of Central and South America apparently have been suspended, except for a few deliveries under secret sailing schedules. Thus, a greater inter-American merchant marine is badly needed, if commerce among the Americas is to be increased.

Another of Welles' statements which met with general approval was his promise of financial aid from private and governmental agencies in the United States in stabilizing the depreciated currencies of many Latin republics.

But, of all his proposals, the one which has shown the greatest possibility of fulfilment is the projected system of loans by the Export-Import Bank to aid the Latin nations in developing their own natural resources. Further advance along these lines was made at the Havana Conference of July, 1940, and the Congress of the United States has recently approved an increase of $500,000,000 in the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank. Under this authority five loans have already been made: one of $4,600,000 to Costa Rica for the completion of the Pan American Highway within the boundaries of that country; another, a $20,000,000 loan to Brazil to aid the development of a domestic steel industry, and three for the purpose of settling balances for purchases in the United States—Uruguay received $7,500,000; Peru, $10,000,000; and Argentina, $60,000,000.

Other resolutions offered for consideration were one on the use of silver as an instrument of international payments, another to check increases in freight and insurance rates, and one favoring the creation of an inter-American financial institute to coordinate the activities of all central banks of the American republics. The first of these, presented by the delegation from Mexico, was obviously an attempt to find some use for the huge supply of silver which that country possesses, and would naturally not be looked upon favorably by the United States, in view of our large supply of gold.

Undoubtedly, the most important decision reached at the Conference was that pertaining to the establishment of a "safety zone" around the hemisphere. After many days of discussion and concessions from both extremes, an agreement was finally reached which broadly provides for a three hundred mile neutrality area. The actual text of the resolution is embodied in a document known as the Declaration of Panama which holds that as long as the American republics maintain their neutrality, they "have the undisputed right to conserve free from all hostile acts by any belligerent non-American nation those waters adjacent to the American continents which they consider of primordial interest and direct utility for their rela-

tions, whether such hostile act is attempted or carried out by land, sea, or air." The area begins at a point on the frontier between the United States and Canada at Passamaquoddy Bay, encircles the southern part of the hemisphere, and terminates at Jean de Fuqua Strait, on the western boundary line between Canada and the United States.

Joint representation was provided for in case of any violation of the zone, but this procedure is secondary to the right of each state to exercise its individual sovereignty. Meetings of consultation to determine individual or collective action in respect to violations were also provided for. The final part of the Declaration provided for individual or collective patrols of waters adjacent to their coasts within the defined zone.

This was the final act of the Conference. On October 3, the Conference was declared adjourned. The following day, President Juan D. Arosemena of Panama, acting for the Americas, notified the governments of Great Britain, France and Germany of the adoption of the Declaration of Panama.

From many sources, this Declaration was hailed as a defensive alliance and as the recognition of a multilateral interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine. On October 4, the famous newspaper, La Nación of Buenos Aires, Argentina, stated editorially, "The declaration presents itself as a complement to the Monroe Doctrine. In reality, it is a step more. It is a continentalization of a doctrine that was high minded but unilateral."

Aside from the question of interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, there arose another vital issue: Would the American nations be able to patrol effectively such a tremendous area? It was obvious that the major burden of the patrol would fall upon the United States Navy because of the fact that Latin American naval forces are of little importance. All of the South American war craft combined total about seventy ships of various kinds. No Latin American nation with the exception of Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, maintains a navy; and these three possess only small fleets. Argentina has twenty-one warships, including two battleships and three submarines available for patrol. Brazil has thirteen ships which includes two battleships and one submarine; Chile, twenty-five, with one battleship, nine submarines, one coast defense ship, three cruisers, and eleven destroyers. Peru is the only other Latin American nation possessing fighting craft. She has two cruisers, three destroyers and four submarines. The majority of these fighting craft are old ships purchased from the United States and various European nations.

It was also observed that aircraft are almost essential for maintaining any effective patrol as far as three hundred miles at sea, and that most Latin American countries are extremely short of the proper type of craft for such patrol duty. Thus, it was quite obvious that the South American nations were inadequately prepared to patrol 8,500 miles on the Atlantic seacoast and 5,300 miles on the Pacific. Nevertheless, the Declaration had been passed. At present about six countries are actively engaged in patrolling the area.

Opponents of the "safety zone" immediately surged to the attack. Most severe in their criticism were the leaders of the Republican Party. Senator

Robert A. Taft, candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, referred to the plan as a "joke . . . perfectly indefensible and ridiculous," while Alfred M. Landon, Republican presidential nominee in 1936, criticized the declaration as setting up a "hazy new zone on the high seas" which raises many questions "full of peril to our neutral position."

Sumner Welles, Under-Secretary of State and head of the United States Delegation to the Panama sessions, immediately answered all critics of the "safety zone." His statement threw a great deal of light upon the attitude of the State Department toward this measure. Said he,

> I have heard it alleged . . . that the Declaration of Panama is bellicose in character and destined to involve our own government in dangerous controversies. I have further heard it alleged that the United States Navy will have to engage in the task of patrolling all of the waters comprised within the security zone. Finally, I have heard it said that the Declaration of Panama is merely a collection of words which really mean nothing and that it will soon be permitted to lapse. All of these assertions are equally unfounded.
>
> I wish to emphasize, that while the American republics thus declare their rights as they have defined them, the second article of the declaration makes it equally apparent that they are solely obligated to endeavor to obtain assurances, by means of joint representations, from the belligerents that these rights will be respected . . .
>
> Should the belligerents refuse to observe the provisions of the declaration . . . the declaration further provides that in such contingency the American republics will consult together to determine what steps they may then individually or collectively take. There is no implication on the part of any American republic to undertake to exercise force in order to procure observance of its terms.

Mr. Welles' statement was proof of the importance attached to the document by the Government of the United States.

None of the belligerents has recognized the principles set forth in the declaration. Both sides have maintained that they cannot keep their ships out of American waters because the other side will not do so. Nevertheless, the number of European ships in American waters is probably far less than it would have been had not the general declaration of neutrality contained a provision prohibiting belligerent vessels from using American waters as bases of operations.

José María Cantilo, Foreign Minister of Argentina, has attempted to formulate a plan for a "safety zone pact" in order to reconcile the ideas of the Americas and those of the belligerents. Recognizing the plan as representing a principle new to the law of nations, he said,

> Europeans cannot pretend that international law is

> something stagnant. They are closing their eyes to reality if they are trying to pretend that an act such as that of the American nations at Panama does not constitute a precedent in international law.
>
> Of course, there is no difference of opinion that whatever alterations may be made in international law must be arrived at by mutual agreement among all interested nations. The American nations, however, are not trying to legislate for others. The rules they adopt are applicable only in the Americas. Whenever any of these provisions reaches persons or things belonging to belligerent powers, it is because international law accords neutral nations the right to establish their own rules of neutrality.
>
> The nations of America expect in the same way that when belligerents desire to impose conditions contrary to existing treaties regarding the rights and duties of belligerents and neutrals they also will consult the neutrals instead of imposing their way by unilateral decisions as they have been doing.

Such a statement, coming from the Foreign Minister of one of the strongest Latin American nations, very definitely showed the unanimity of opinion which has been growing since the Declaration of Continental Solidarity was approved at Lima, in 1938.

In fine, the purpose of the Declaration of Panama was to remind the belligerents that this war is their affair and that by keeping their ships out of American waters they will remove the danger of incidents and fulfill their obligations to the neutral nations on this side of the Atlantic by not interfering with our coastwise shipping.

Nevertheless, several flagrant violations of the zone have occurred. Most notable of these was the battle between the British cruisers Ajax, Achilles, and Exeter and the German pocket battleship Graf Spee, which terminated with the scuttling of the latter in the harbor of Montevideo, Uruguay. Several other ships including the German liner, Columbus, the German freighter, Wakama, the German merchantman, Tacoma, and the British steamship, Clement have either been sunk or scuttled within the safety zone. Formal protests are answered with formal replies, and American waters remain a playground for belligerent vessels.

From all appearances, the "safety zone" has not been as successful in clearing American waters of hostile ships as was originally hoped.

What, then, have been the lasting results, if any, of the Panama Conference?

Before answering this question, it is well to recall the purpose for which the sessions were called, namely, to provide immediate defenses, economic, military, and political, to absorb the shock of the European conflict.

The first lasting result of the Conference was the establishment of an Inter-American Neutrality Commission to sit at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil for

the duration of the war. The Commission is composed of seven experts in international law whose duty it is to study and formulate recommendations with respect to the problems of neutrality, which will be transmitted through the Pan American Union to the governments of the American republics. Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Mexico, Venezuela and the United States are represented on the Commission. At present, it is considering such problems as the treatment of belligerent submarines, merchant ships and auxiliary warships in American waters. The result of their work will make possible a unified attitude toward violations of the rights of neutral American nations.

The other enduring result of the Panama deliberations is the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee. This body composed of one representative from each of the American nations will sit in Washington, D. C. for the remainder of the war. Its duties are primarily to consider problems of an economic nature arising from the European conflict, to deal with questions of general policy, to carefully consider the twenty-seven projects of an economic and financial nature which were submitted to the sessions at Panama, and to coordinate the various inter-American information sources so that quick and ready facts concerning the economic life of the hemisphere will be available at all times. They will also cooperate with the periodic sessions of the Pan American Finance Ministers, provided for by the Lima Conference.

The Panama Conference was an important step in the recent trend of Western Hemisphere cooperation for what has been termed a "cooperative peace." Its three outstanding contributions—the three hundred mile "safety zone," the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee, and the establishment of a common policy of neutrality—mark it as a successful conference. These three points are the "teeth" which the resolutions passed at Buenos Aires in 1936 and at Lima in 1938 so badly needed.

Without a doubt, the conference was the most realistic held up to that time. The meeting proved that the Americas are aware of the potential threat of totalitarian aggression, and resulted in the strongest demonstration of American unity yet seen.

THE SECOND CONSULTATIVE CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN FOREIGN MINISTERS, HELD AT HAVANA, JULY, 1940.

BERNARD J. FLATOW

The Havana Consultative Conference of American Foreign Ministers was the second of this type to be held under the system of consultation established at the Eighth regular Pan American Conference, held at Lima, Peru, in 1938. Called at the request of the United States, the conference faced three very perplexing problems.

The first of these, a remainder from the Panama Conference, yet now even more complicated and pressing than before, was the question of economic defense for the hemisphere. It had been found that the measures taken along these lines at the Panama Conference, while apparently sufficient to cope with the situation at that time, were unable to solve the intricate economic and financial problems which had arisen in the interim.

The second was concerned with the threat of subversive activities in the countries of this hemisphere directed from outside.

The third dealt with European possessions within the hemisphere, and the possibility of a transfer of their sovereignty from one non-American state to another non-American state.

Before the sessions had begun, it had been made clear that the United States Government viewed the conference as the American answer to the economic aims of Germany in the New World. It was quite evident that the majority sentiment of the meeting would be pro-British, yet no outward demonstration of this attitude would be given. The feelings of the United States Government were so strongly pro-British that Secretary of State Hull went so far as to warn Germany to refrain from any attempt to intimidate the Latin American nations. This warning came as a response to a report that Dr. Otto Reinebeck, German Minister to Panama and the five Central American republics, had sent a message to the foreign ministers of those countries, criticizing the forthcoming conference and expressing the hope that no action "aimed directly or indirectly against Germany" would be taken. This message aroused the Central American nations to openly express their entire support of United States' hemisphere defense and economic proposals. The newspaper *La Tribuna* of San José, Costa Rica, termed the note "an unheard-of act damaging the free use of our sovereignty." Incidents such as this make one wonder about the genius of German diplomacy. They serve only to antagonize the countries to whom the notes are sent, and to arouse contempt for the German Government.

The question of economic defense for the hemisphere had been the highlight of all pre-conference discussion and prediction. A lot of talk was heard about a "hemisphere cartel" to set up a sellers' pool of the Americas in order to combat the tactics of the buyers' pool which Germany has talked of as a post war European institution. It was suggested that the plan take the form of a huge corporation to be subsidized by the United

States which would buy up Latin American, and perhaps Canadian, surpluses and resell them to Europe when the market was favorable. Thus, the Latin American nations would do business with the corporation rather than become subjected to Nazi political penetration through the Aski mark and barter systems of trading. Besides this buying up of surpluses, the plan concerned itself with a system of crop control to prevent deliberate overproduction, and an attempt to develop new products and industries in Latin America—especially in the one and two crop countries. It was estimated that the capitalization of such a corporation would fall between one and two billion dollars. President Roosevelt, in a statement issued on June 21, 1940, said that the program was only an emergency measure and not intended in any way to replace the system of reciprocal trade treaties. If the program had been adopted, it would probably have become more permanent than anyone had at first expected, for reciprocal trade treaties are absolutely impracticable in a market that recognizes barter and pool systems of trading. However, the "cartel" plan never reached beyond the desks of Latin American ministers, where it was definitely rejected. Many Latin Americans considered it too large to be feasible; others saw advantage to the United States only. Nevertheless, the administration did not give up the idea of hemispheric economic defense and immediately proposed an increase of $500,000,000 in the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank to further inter-American trade. This plan is aimed at four main objectives:

1. Increased trade between the United States and Latin America by financing purchases of exports from this country.
2. Assistance in the industrialization of Latin American nations to an extent that their economies will not be so dependent upon foreign products.
3. Develop trade among the twenty Latin American republics by aiding them to buy from each other.
4. Enable the Latin American countries to hold their agricultural surpluses until they can dispose of them in an orderly way without the need of accepting the political stipulations of European powers.

President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, and Jesse Jones, Federal Loan Administrator, all favor this latter plan. It has been passed by the Congress of the United States and is now in operation. Five big loans have already been made under it—one to Costa Rica, for internal highway improvements, another to Brazil, to aid in the development of a steel industry, and three to Uruquay, Peru, and Argentina to enable them to pay for purchases in the United States. Essentially, it attempts to do the same things as did the "cartel" plan. The latter scheme was an attractive one—if for no other reason than its immenseness, and if it had been put into effect, it would have been the first large-scale, cooperative economic effort of any significance among the American nations. Fortunately, it did not materialize; it would have been discouraging

to see their first effort fail. The idea behind such a plan is good, but can only be made practicable through careful planning on a small scale. The loan plan is attempting to do just that. The control of surpluses was never intended to be solved hemispherically. The United States has not been very successful in solving its own, nationally.

What did result from the deliberations was a resolution proclaiming the unanimous desire of solving the economic and financial difficulties of the hemisphere, and several recommendations for their immediate solution. Aside from restating their faith in liberal principles of international commerce, the delegates agreed to strengthen the Inter-American Economic and Financial Advisory Committee, created by the Panama Conference, by charging it to do the following:

a. Cooperate with each country in a study of the possible measures for the increase of internal consumption of its own export surpluses of those fundamental products of the economic life of the same.
b. Propose immediate measures for the increase of interchange among all of the countries.
c. Create instruments of inter-American cooperation for warehousing, financing, and transitory disposition of the surpluses of said products, as well as for their orderly distribution and sale.
d. Propose the celebration of agreements concerning said products with the aim to assure equitable conditions of interchange.
e. Recommend methods to raise the level of life of the peoples of America, including measures for the improvement of public health and good nutrition.
f. Establish appropriate organisms for the distribution of a part of the surplus of any of said products as a humanitarian measure and social aid.
g. Consider, while these plans and recourses are being developed, the establishment of a broader system of inter-American cooperation in matters relating to measures of credit and other aids which might be immediately necessary in economic, financial and monetary matters and in foreign exchange.

The resolution also proposed the establishment of enterprises, either private or governmental, in each country for the purpose of acting as a central loan agency in that country in cooperation with the Inter-American Bank.

The results of this economic agreement fall into two distinct classes:

1. Resolutions aimed at solving the immediate problems created by the conflict in Europe.
2. Action designed to ultimately raise the standard of living in Latin America and for the introduction of new industries into areas of economic specialization.

Under this agreement, negotiations between Argentina and Brazil have already begun. The former has a large surplus of wheat and meat and the latter, who for years has grown more coffee than she could sell, has an exceptionally large supply on hand. Whether or not they may relieve each other of sufficient quantities of these products to actually alleviate the strain caused by European underconsumption remains to be seen. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the resolutions adopted at this conference together with those of the Panama Conference constitute a definite program of hemispherical economic cooperation, as an arm of the larger program of total hemisphere defense.

The second important problem facing the conference concerned the subversive activities in the American nations of persons and groups advocating overthrow of the existing governments and the adoption of totalitarian philosophies. Never before had subversive propaganda and professional spying been regarded as a problem of hemispheric interest. Until this time, each country had been satisfied to treat these questions as purely local problems. The recognition of the potential danger of such "local" activities was another demonstration of the awareness of the people of this hemisphere that a threat to one is a threat to all.

The attitude of the Havana Conference toward this question is embodied in three resolutions which reiterate the determination of the Americas to remain free from all foreign political penetration. The first of these urges the various American governments to "prevent . . . political activities of foreign diplomatic or consular agents . . . which may endanger the peace and democratic tradition of America." The second urges the same treatment for all activities "directed, assisted or abetted by foreign governments, or foreign groups or individuals, which tend . . . to foment disorder" in the political life of any American nation. It also provides for immediate consultation "in the event that the peace of any of the American republics is menaced by such activities," and for the interchange of all information concerning such activities in any of the countries. The last of these resolutions deals with the diffusion of doctrines tending to place in jeopardy the common inter-American democratic ideal or to threaten the security and neutrality of the Americas. It recommends a precise set of rules with respect to the treatment of civil strife, internal disturbances, and the spread of subversive idealogies, covering such questions as the crossing of American boundaries for any of the above-mentioned purposes, the transportation of arms for the purpose of revolution, the equipment of ships for such a purpose, etc. It also suggests legislative norms to regulate the juridical status of foreigners. Under this clause are found such items as the prohibition of political activity by foreign individuals, associations, groups or political parties, no matter what form they use to disguise or cloak such activity; the rigorous supervision of the entry of all foreigners; effective police supervision of all foreign non-American groups; and the creation of an emergency penal system to deal with those engaged in subversive activities.

This resolution will probably have a greater unifying effect than any

other adopted at the conference, if for no other reason than its designation of a common enemy.

The final and truly perplexing problem facing the delegates concerned the status of regions in this hemisphere belonging to European nations and the possibility of a transfer of sovereignty from one European nation to another. This clearly referred to the French colonies scattered along the Atlantic coastline and to the possibility of Great Britain being placed in the same position as her former ally. In view of this fact, the conferees declared that when any "regions in the Americas now under the possession of non-American nations are in danger of becoming the subject of barter of territory or change of sovereignty" the American nations may set up a regime of provisional administration. This temporary government would remain until the reasons which required its creation no longer existed; then the region would either be restored to its former status, be organized as an autonomous state, or granted the right to determine its own destiny, whichever of these alternatives should appear the most practicable and just. The American republics as a whole would be the administrative agency of such regions. Several delegates signed this Act of Havana with reservations; those from Argentina, Colombia, Chile, Uruguay, and Venezuela all signed subject to the approval of their respective governments, while the delegation of Chile also called attention to the rights of that country in Antartica. An elaborate system of rules and regulations governing the provisional administration of any of the aforementioned regions was embodied in a special convention which created the Inter-American Commission for Territorial Administration. This body, composed of a representative from each state which ratifies the convention, shall be responsible for the government of supervised regions.

In conclusion, what may we say, in general, about the Havana Conference? In the words of Mr. Hull, it "cleared the decks for effective action whenever it may be necessary." Almost everyone else was of the same opinion. In fact, the only derogatory criticism of the sessions came from German and Italian newspapers and spokesmen who had poked fun at the efforts of the delegates even before the meeting had opened.

Havana, while in itself important for the action taken to protect the Americas from foreign political penetration, was another great step in the development of a hemispheric defense consciousness.

SUGGESTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

General Works

Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Spaniards, by Salvador de Madariaga. London: Oxford, 1931.

South American Primer, by Katherine Carr. N. Y.: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1939.

Latin America: Its Place in World Life, by Samuel Guy Inman. Chicago: Willett Clark, 1937.

America South, by Carleton Beals. N. Y.: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1937.

The Coming Struggle For Latin America, by Carleton Beals. J. B. Lippincott Co., 1938.

Latin America, by Stephen Duggan. World Peace Foundation; N. Y. 1936.

The Two Americas: an interpretation, by Stephen Duggan. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

The All-American Front, by Duncan Aikman. N. Y.: Doubleday Doran and Co., 1940.

The Caribbean: The Story of Our Sea of Destiny, by W. Adolphe Roberts. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1940.

Some Special Problems

Latin America in World Politics, by J. Fred Rippy. N. Y.: A. A. Knopf, 1928.

Latin American Relations With The League of Nations, by Warren H. Kelchner. World Peace Foundation, Boston, 1929.

Church and State in Latin America, by J. Lloyd Mecham. University of North Carolina Press, 1934.

Latin American Problems, by Thomas F. Lee. N. Y.: Brewer, Warren, and Putnam, 1932.

Whither Latin America? by Frank Tannebaum. N. Y.: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1934.

Democracy Versus The Totalitarian State in Latin America, by Samuel Guy Inman. Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, Pamphlet series No. 7, 1938.

Recent Novels Concerning Latin America

To The Indies, by C. S. Forester. Little, Brown Co. 1940.

Cuba Libre, by MacKinlay Kantor. Coward-McCann Co. 1940.

The Terror of Peru, by Meade Minnigerode. Farrar and Rinehart; N. Y. 1940.

The Way To Santiago, by Arthur Calder-Marshall. N. Y.: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1940.

Books About Mexico

Mexico—a study of two Americas, by Stuart Chase. N. Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1931.

Mexico Marches, by J. H. Plenn. N. Y.: Bobbs-Merrill Co. 1939.
The Ejido; Mexico's Way Out, by Eyler N. Simpson. University of North Carolina Press, 1937.
Mexico At The Bar Of Public Opinion, by Burt M. McConnell. N. Y.: Mail and Express Publishing Co. 1939.
Expropriation in Mexico, by Roscoe B. Gaither. N. Y.: William Morrow and Co. 1940.
The Mexican Touch, by Edwa Moser. Duell, Sloan and Pearce. 1940.

TRANSLATIONS OF LATIN AMERICAN WORKS

Don Segundo Sombra, by Ricardo Guiraldes. N. Y.: Farrar and Rinehart. 1935. (Argentina)
Martin Fierro, by José Hernández. Translated by Walter Owen; N. Y.; Farrar and Rinehart, 1936. (Argentina)
María, by Jorge Isaacs. N. Y.: Harper's, 1922. (Colombia)
Doña Bárbara, by Romulo Gallegos. N. Y.: 1931. (Venezuela)
The Destiny of a Continent, (El Destino de un Continente), by Manuel Ugarte. N. Y.: A. A. Knopf, 1925. (Argentina)
Ariel, by José Enrique Rodó. Translated by F. J. Stimpson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1922. (Uruguay)
The Under Dogs, (Los de Abajo), by Mariano Azuela. N. Y.: Brentano's, 1929. (Mexico)
Martin Rivas, by Alberto Blest Gana. N. Y.: A. A. Knopf, 1918. (Chile)
Amalia, by José Marmol. N. Y.: Dutton, 1919. (Argentina)

MAY 3 1 1941

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA EXTENSION BULLETIN

VOL. XX NOVEMBER, 1940 NO. 4

CORRESPONDENCE INSTRUCTION

ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR THE SESSIONS 1941-1943

Published six times a year, July, September, October, November, January, and March, by the University of North Carolina Press. Entered as second-class matter October 19, 1921, Chapel Hill, N. C.

EXTENSION BULLETINS

Vol.	VII, No.	9.	*Special Legal Relations of Married Women in N. C. as to Property, Contracts, and Guardianship.* Mary P. Smith. Price 25c.
Vol.	VIII, No.	5.	*The World Court.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	VIII, No.	7.	*Scenery and Lighting for School and Little Theatre Stages.* Samuel Selden. Price 50c.
Vol.	IX, No.	4.	*The Classification of Property for Taxation.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	X, No.	5.	*Independence for the Philippines.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XI, No.	3.	*Compulsory Unemployment Insurance.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XII, No.	5.	*The Sales Tax.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XIII, No.	3.	*Radio Control and Operation.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XIV, No.	2.	*Federal Aid to Education.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XV, No.	1.	*Play Producing for Schools and Little Theatres.* Frederick H. Koch and staff members of the Carolina Playmakers. Price 50c.
Vol.	XV, No.	2.	*Socialization of Medicine.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVI, No.	2.	*Government Ownership and Operation of Electric Utilities.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVI, No.	4.	*Plays for Schools and Little Theatres (Revised).* Price 50c.
Vol.	XVII, No.	3.	*Unicameral Legislatures.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVII, No.	4.	*First Principles of Play Direction.* Samuel Selden. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVIII, No.	2.	*Anglo-American Alliance.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XIX, No.	2.	*Government Ownership and Operation of the Railroads.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XX, No.	1.	*Universal Military Training.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XX, No.	2.	*Academic Contests for North Carolina High Schools.* Announcement for the year 1940-41. Free.
Vol.	XX, No.	3.	*Inter-American Relations.* Price 25c.

MONEY ORDERS, CHECKS, OR STAMPS ACCEPTED

ADDRESS: UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION,

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION

BUREAU OF CORRESPONDENCE INSTRUCTION

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

'RANK PORTER GRAHAM, M.A., LL.D., D.C.L., D.Litt., *President.*
:OBERT BURTON HOUSE, A.M., LL.D., *Dean of Administration.*
:USSELL MARVIN GRUMMAN, B.H., *Director.*
VILLIAM JOHN MCKEE, C.E., Ph.D., *Supervisor of Instruction.*
IARY LOUISA COBB, A.B., *Chief of Bureau of Correspondence Instruction.*
IELLIE ROBERSON, A.B., *Chief of Library Extension Service.*

ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD*

)UDLEY DEWITT CARROLL, M.A., *Professor of Economics and Dean of the School of Commerce.*
VESLEY CRITZ GEORGE, Ph.D., *Professor of Histology and Embryology.*
ILLAN WILSON HOBBS, Ph.D., *Professor of Applied Mathematics and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.*
AMUEL HUNTINGTON HOBBS, JR., Ph.D., *Professor of Rural Social-Economics.*
VILLIAM JOHN MCKEE, C.E., Ph.D., *Professor of Education in Extension Teaching and Head of the Department of In-Service Teacher Training.*
IOWARD WASHINGTON ODUM, Ph.D., *Kenan Professor of Sociology.*
VILLIAM WHATLEY PIERSON, Ph.D., *Professor of History and Political Science and Dean of the Graduate School.*
VILL CARSON RYAN, Ph.D., LL.D., *Kenan Professor of Education.*

CORRESPONDENCE INSTRUCTORS

AMES OSLER BAILEY, Ph.D., *Assistant Professor of English.*
ILADYS ANGEL BEARD, M.A., *Assistant Professor of Health and Physical Education and Director of Physical Education for Women.*
ANTOINETTE MONTFORD BEASLEY, A.B., *Graduate Assistant in Education.*
*GORDON WILLIAM BLACKWELL, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Sociology.*
EE MARSHALL BROOKS, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Sociology.*
VALLACE EVERETT CALDWELL, Ph.D., *Professor of Ancient History.*
:DWARD ALEXANDER CAMERON, Ph.D., *Assistant Professor of Mathematics.*
AMES RICHARD CHILES, A.B., *Graduate Assistant in English.*
'REDERICK EDWARD COENEN, Ph.D., *Assistant Professor of German.*
:OBERT WILLINGHAM CRUTCHFIELD, A.B., *Instructor in Commerce.*
:. HARRIS DAGGETT, M.A., *Instructor in English.*
AMUEL THOMAS EMORY, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Geography.*
'RANKLIN CARL ERICKSON, Ph.D., *Assistant Professor of Geology.*
'LETCHER MELVIN GREEN, Ph.D., *Professor of History.*
OHN MINOR GWYNN, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of the Teaching of Latin.*
:ARL HORACE HARTSELL, A.M., *Instructor in English.*
ANGSTON THACKER HAWLEY, M.S., *Instructor in Economics.*
ILEN HAYDON, Ph.D., *Professor of Music.*
IILTON SIDNEY HEATH, Ph.D., *Professor of Economics.*
:ICHARD JUNIUS MENDENHALL HOBBS, A.B., LL.B., *Professor of Business Law.*

---

* The Dean of Administration, the Registrar, and the Dean of Students are *ex officio* members of the Administrative Board.
** Beginning University session 1941-42.

SAMUEL HUNTINGTON HOBBS, JR., Ph.D., *Professor of Rural Social-Economics.*
GEORGE FREDERICK HORNER, Ph.D., *Instructor in English.*
VINTON ASBURY HOYLE, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Mathematics.*
ARTHUR PALMER HUDSON, Ph.D., *Professor of English.*
WILLIAM SUMNER JENKINS, Ph.D., LL.B., *Associate Professor of Politica Science.*
CECIL JOHNSON, Ph.D., *Assistant Professor of History.*
GUY BENTON JOHNSON, Ph.D., *Research Associate in the Institute for Re search in Social Science.*
ARTHUR MELVILLE JORDAN, Ph.D., *Professor of Educational Psychology.*
DONALD STANLEY KLAISS, Ph.D., *Research Associate in the Institute fo Research in Social Science.*
EDGAR WALLACE KNIGHT, Ph.D., *Kenan Professor of Education.*
ROBERT ALAN KOCH, A.B., *Graduate Assistant in Art.*
JOHN WAYNE LASLEY, JR., Ph.D., *Professor of Pure Mathematics.*
HUGH TALMADGE LEFLER, Ph.D., *Professor of History.*
*JOE BURTON LINKER, Ph.D., *Professor of Mathematics.*
JOHN CORIDEN LYONS, Ph.D., *Professor of French.*
WILLIAM JOHN MCKEE, C.E., Ph.D., *Professor of Education in Extensio Teaching.*
WILLIAM ALBERT MCKNIGHT, M.A., *Instructor in Spanish.*
DONALD FRAZIER MARTIN, A.M., *Instructor in Economics.*
HAROLD DIEDRICK MEYER, A.M., LL.D., *Professor of Sociology.*
FREDERIC MEYERS, A.M., *Instructor in Economics.*
ALBERT RAY NEWSOME, Ph.D., *Professor of History.*
CARL HAMILTON PEGG, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Social Science.*
GUY BERRYMAN PHILLIPS, A.B., *Professor of Education.*
CARLETON ESTEY PRESTON, Ph.D., *Professor of the Teaching of Science.*
WILLIAM FREDERICK PROUTY, Ph.D., *Professor of Stratigraphic Geology.*
CHARLES BASKERVILLE ROBSON, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Political Science.*
ROBERT CLAYTON ROGERS, M.S., *Instructor in Psychology.*
JOSIAH COX RUSSELL, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of History.*
WILL CARSON RYAN, Ph.D., LL.D., *Kenan Professor of Education.*
SHIPP GILLESPIE SANDERS, A.M., *Professor of Latin.*
JAN PHILIP SCHINHAN, Ph.D., *Assistant Professor of Music.*
HERMAN WALKER SCHNELL, A.M., *Assistant Professor of Physical Education*
ROBERT BOIES SHARPE, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of English.*
WALTER SPEARMAN, A.M., *Assistant Professor of Journalism.*
ALBERT IRVING SUSKIN, Ph.D., *Instructor in Latin.*
WILLIAM LESTER WILSON, A.M., *Creative English.*
EARL WYNN, M.S., *Instructor in Dramatic Art.*

---

* On leave 1940-41.

LIST OF COURSES

(See pages 6 and 7 for information regarding fees.)

PAGE

Art 17
- History and Appreciation of Ancient and Medieval Art
- History and Appreciation of Renaissance Art
- History and Appreciation of Modern Art

Dramatic Art 17-18
- Shakespeare (See English)
- Playwriting
- Modern Drama

Economics and Commerce 18-19
- General Economics
- Economic History
- Accounting
- Business Law
- Business English

Education 19-24
- General Introduction to the Study of Education
- Introduction to Educational Psychology
- Educational Psychology
- Classroom Management
- Children's Literature
- Principles and Methods of Secondary Education
- Basic Principles and Techniques in Educational Administration
- The Public School Principalship
- Principles and Methods in Adult Education
- Adult Education—A General Survey
- Education in the South
- Historic Foundations of Modern Education
- Social and Educational History of the United States
- The Teaching of the Natural Sciences in the Elementary Grades
- Curriculum Construction
- Tests and Measurements in Education
- The Psychology of the Elementary School
- Growth and Development of the School Child
- School Hygiene and Health Education
- Reading and Study Habits for the Elementary Grades
- The Teaching of Arithmetic in the Elementary Grades
- Language Arts in the Elementary Grades
- Problems of Citizenship
- Educational Sociology (See Sociology)
- The Organization and Operation of the Public Employment Service (See Political Science)

English 24-25
- Freshman English
- English of Commerce
- English Literature (Sophomore Course)
- English Literature, 1780-1830
- Shakespeare
- Introduction to the Short Story
- Creative Writing: The Short Story
- Creative Writing: The Short Story (Advanced)
- American Literature
- The English Novel
- Modern Drama (See Dramatic Art)
- Playwriting (See Dramatic Art)

Geology and Geography 26-27
- Introduction to General Geology
- Elementary Geography (Natural Science)
- Principles of Geography
- Introduction to Geography
- Industrial and Commercial Geography

PAGE

German 27
Intermediate German
Advanced German

History 27-28
Social Science
American History
Ancient History
English History
Diplomatic History of the United States, 1776-1940
North Carolina History
Social and Educational History of the United States (See Education)

Journalism 28
Writing Publicity for Clubs

Latin 29
Readings in Roman Literature
Latin Composition
Intermediate Latin
Latin Poetry

Mathematics 29-30
Introductory Mathematics
College Algebra
Trigonometry

Music 30
Elementary Theory of Music
Harmony
History of Music

Physical Education 30
Personal Hygiene

PAGE

Political Science 31
The Government of the United States
The Governments of Europe
American State Government
The Organization and Operation of the Public Employment Service (Public Administration)

Psychology 31
General Psychology

Romance Languages 31-32
Intermediate French—Composition and Reading
Advanced French — Composition and Reading
French Literature
Spanish Composition
Spanish Literature

Sociology 33-35
Introduction to Sociology
Social Problems
The Family
Educational Sociology
Play and Recreation
Extra-Curricular Activities
Regional Sociology of the South
The Cooperative Movement
The Negro
Rural Economics
Histry of Agriculture
Rural Sociology
North Carolina: Economic and Social

(For courses offered at State College, Raleigh, N. C., see pp. 36-38.)

CORRESPONDENCE INSTRUCTION

This catalogue explains in detail the correspondence work offered at Chapel Hill by the Extension Division of the University of North Carolina. The courses offered at the State College of Agriculture and Engineering in Raleigh are listed on pages 36-38. Full information regarding these may be secured by writing to that institution.

The effectiveness of university teaching by correspondence has been clearly demonstrated. Home study enables one, in his spare time, to carry on studies in which he has a special interest, to broaden his intellectual outlook, or to make up deficiencies in his education. It is designed to give continuous educational opportunities to those who desire to learn, regardless of years or former academic accomplishments.

The advantages of individual study by means of correspondence are obvious. The student recites on every part of every lesson and receives the individual attention of the teacher in the correction of the papers he submits. Since a student is not hurried in his work, he can master the material thoroughly.

The courses listed herein may be pursued by any one who is prepared to study them with profit. Those who expect to secure credit towards a degree must, of course, satisfy the entrance and other requirements. However, those who do not desire or expect such credit are permitted to register for any course in which they have an interest. Non-credit students are given the same careful instruction as those who are candidates for a degree.

General Information

Correspondence study is simply a method of learning through the directed study of textbooks and supplementary material, writing the answers to the questions, and developing lines of thought contained in each assignment. Each assignment includes: (a) full directions for study, including references to textbooks by chapter and page; (b) suggestions and helps of the instructor; (c) questions to develop an understanding of the work done. When a student has registered for a course three assignments are sent him. He does the work outlined in the first assignment and sends his paper to the Extension Division, and then begins work on the second assignment. At the University each paper is gone over by the instructor, who carefully corrects and grades it and places on it constructive criticism and helpful suggestions for future study. Upon receipt of completed assignments, additional ones will be sent the student. While it is very desirable that the student send in work regularly, at least one assignment each week, he has the privilege of sending it in as he is able to complete it, *provided he does not submit more than four assignments a week in each course.*

Credit

Unless otherwise noted, all courses offered count toward the A.B. degree at this institution. Some courses are credited toward S.B. degrees. No courses offered count toward the master's degree.

To work out a systematic plan for taking correspondence instruction toward the A.B. degree, study carefully the *Requirements for Bachelors' Degrees* found on pages 13-14. Courses marked with an asterisk (*) are given by correspondence. The other courses listed in this catalogue are elective.

The State Department of Public Instruction at Raleigh will, in accordance with their regulations, credit all courses listed in this catalogue (except those listed as non-credit courses) toward state teachers' certificates. See pages 9-10 regarding amount of credit allowed and distribution.

For credit toward a degree not more than the equivalent of one and one-half years of residence work, 45 semester hours or 67½ quarter hours, may be earned by extension. *Of this amount only 30 semester hours or 45 quarter hours may be taken by correspondence.* One-third of the total amount, 15 semester hours or 22½ quarter hours, is the maximum of correspondence work that may be completed in any twelve-month period. It is expected that the last year's work will be taken in residence. Special cases will be handled individually.

Entrance Requirements

If degree credit is desired an applicant for correspondence work must meet the University entrance requirements of at least fifteen acceptable units from an accredited high school. The high school record must be transferred to the University on a blank that will be furnished for the purpose. An applicant for advanced standing may be ranked as a sophomore, junior, or senior when credit for work taken at other colleges has been properly transferred to the University and accepted by the examining committee.

If *certification credit only* is desired, correspondence courses may be taken by any teacher who holds a Standard State Certificate.

Nature of Courses

Each correspondence course has been developed by a member of the faculty so that it parallels a course given in residence in the same subject and covers an equal amount of work for which equal credit is given. Although it may vary, a correspondence course which gives two semester hours' or three quarter hours' credit has about sixteen assignments and one which gives three and one-third semester hours' or five quarter hours' credit has about twenty-seven assignments. Each assignment covers approximately two days of residence work. On such assignments a student is expected to put approximately six hours, or else sufficient time to do the work in the best possible manner. Where there is a small number of assignments in a course each assignment covers several days of residence work. The number of assignments in a course is really incidental, since the total amount of work for a unit of credit is always the same.

Fees and Refunds

Each student pays, at the time of his enrollment, a registration fee of two dollars ($2.00) which shall entitle him to administrative and office service for one year. Unless otherwise stated, residents of North Carolina

are charged a fee of eight dollars ($8.00) for a two semester hour or three quarter hour course and thirteen dollars and fifty cents ($13.50) for a three and one-third semester hour or five quarter hour course. For non-residents the fees are ten dollars ($10.00) for the former and seventeen dollars and fifty cents ($17.50) for the latter, payable at the time of enrollment.

No course fee or parts of such can be refunded after a course is once begun. In the event that no work has been done during the first three months and application is made within that time, a portion of the fee will be refunded, provided a good cause is given for discontinuing. A course fee holds good for one year and five weeks only. If it is desired to continue a course not completed within that time, a renewal fee of two dollars ($2.00) for a two semester hour or three quarter hour course and three dollars ($3.00) for each three and one-third semester hour or five quarter course will be required in order to extend the time for six months. Only one renewal is allowed.

Books and Supplies

Textbooks are purchased by the students themselves, usually through the Extension Division. When a student has finished a course the Division will repurchase books that are in good condition if the student desires to sell them, provided the course has not been discontinued or revised and the Division is not sufficiently stocked.

The Bureau will not be responsible for books sent in for repurchase unless a three-cent envelope containing a letter giving the name of the student, address, name of the course for which the books were used, and reason for return is pasted on the package of books.

Upon application, reference books for supplementary reading may be borrowed from the University Library Extension Service at a slight expense to the student for postage and packing. In some instances supplementary texts may be rented from the Bureau of Correspondence Instruction.

Light-weight paper suitable for typewriter or pen may be purchased from the Bureau. This is recommended in order to save postage.

Rules Governing Correspondence Work

1. Not more than two enrollments may be had at one time, and it is advisable to complete one course before registering for another.

2. Students may enroll for correspondence work at any time during the year.

3. Work taken by correspondence must be completed within one year and five weeks from the date of registration or a renewal fee will be required.

4. Those who wish credit must take a final examination on completion of all assignments in a course. This may be taken either at the University or at home under conditions approved by the University. It should be taken no later than one month after the last assignment has been returned corrected. The examination must be passed if credit is to be allowed.

5. It is desirable that students send in at least one assignment a week. *Only four assignments per week are accepted in a course.*

6. A subject previously taken in any institution for which either degree or certification credit has already been given cannot be taken for credit by correspondence.

7. For credit toward a degree not more than the equivalent of one and one-half years of residence work, which is 45 semester hours or 67½ quarter hours, may be earned by extension. *Only 30 semester hours or 45 quarter hours may be taken by correspondence.* One-third of the total amount, 15 semester hours or 22½ quarter hours, is the maximum of correspondence work that may be completed in any twelve-month period. It is expected that the last year's work will be taken in residence. Special cases will be handled individually.

8. Correspondence work cannot be taken at the same time residence work is being taken without special permission from the student's dean.

9. Persons who are not *bona fide* residents of Chapel Hill must secure the approval of University authorities to remain in town and take correspondence courses.

10. When a student has completed a correspondence course all assignments must be returned to the Extension Division before a final grade or credit will be given.

11. It is expected that students will not take work from more than one institution at a time.

Standards

The Bureau emphasizes the importance of the individual guidance of students by instructors. This involves the evaluation of students' work and the giving of helpful suggestions according to individual needs.

All students will be expected to submit their assignments in good form, grammatical and otherwise, acceptable to the instructor and in line with the requirements of the University. If an instructor in any department finds that the English composition of a student is below the standard, the symbol *cc* (composition condition) may accompany the final grade, as for instance Bcc, Ccc, or Dcc. This will indicate that, although the instructor has accepted as satisfactory the student's knowledge of the subject matter of the course, the penmanship, punctuation, spelling, vocabulary, or organization of the written work is not up to the University standard. A student receiving such a grade may remove the condition by doing work in residence assigned by the English Department or by completing successfully either of the correspondence courses English c1 or English c51.

The Honor System

Correspondence courses, like residence courses, are on the honor basis. The student body of the University has through a century of traditions developed an honor spirit and an honor system. A student who plagiarizes, copies, cheats, or in any way does dishonest work is not only denied credit for the course but is also dismissed from the University by his fellow stu-

dents. Work must be honest above all other qualities. Each correspondence student is on his honor to do only honest work.

To make certain that there is no semblance of dishonor it should be an unfailing habit *never* to use the textbook or any other materials or aids when writing answers to questions.

No credit will be given for a course in case the student has been false to the pledge of honor. No refund will be made in such case.

Transferring Credit

A record of the extension work completed towards a degree will be transferred to another institution when this request is made by the student. For its own degrees the University of North Carolina makes no distinction between credit obtained in extension and that obtained in residence, except that there is a limit to the amount of extension work that can count towards a degree. But the University cannot determine the policy of other institutions in regard to accepting towards their degrees credit for work completed in extension elsewhere. There are very few standard colleges or universities at this time, however, that do not accept credit for work completed through extension instruction in other standard colleges or universities. There is usually an interchange of credits between the various institutions which are members of the National University Extension Association.

The Extension Division will transfer credit to the State Department of Public Instruction to be applied toward teachers' certificates on the dates nearest the completion of the work. The State Department has requested the Division to transfer credit for this purpose at only two stated times during the year—June 1st and September 1st. Unless the work is completed before September 1st, credit will not be allowed by the State Department as of the June preceding but will be carried forward to the June next succeeding.

Special Notices to Teachers

Teachers who need *professional courses* must be sure to choose them in their own professional field. For instance, a primary teacher should not take a course in high school methods. If courses for *professional credit* are needed, this should be indicated on the application blank printed at the end of this catalogue.

Teachers who fail to complete the equivalent of one summer school unit of work while in summer school may finish the unit by extension, provided the credit earned is not in excess of the amount allowed by the State Department of Public Instruction. The following regulations have been adopted by the State Department:

1. No teacher in service shall be given credit for more than twenty semester hours during any one year between September 1st of that year and August 31st of the following year, a teacher in service being defined as one who teaches six or more months during the period. This, it must be understood, is the maximum total credit from all sources.

2. No teacher in service shall be given credit for more than twelve semester hours of extension class teaching or correspondence study instruction in any year between September 1st of that year and August 31st of the following year, with not more than eight semester hours permitted between September 1st and June 1st following.

3. Not more than forty per cent of the credit necessary to raise a certificate from one class to another may be earned through extension class teaching and/or correspondence study instruction.

4. The original professional credit necessary for an administrative or supervisory certificate may not be secured through extension class teaching and/or correspondence study instruction.

5. Not more than sixteen semester hours' extension credit may be earned with the same instructor.

The work required for A Certificates, as outlined by the State Department of Public Instruction is as follows:

High School Teachers' Certificates Issued as of July 1, 1931, and Thereafter

Beginning September 1, 1941, this certificate will require graduation from a standard four year college, including the following:

I. The professional requirements common to all certificates shall be:
- †1. Educational Psychology ..... 2 semester hours
- 2. Principles of High School Teaching or Problems in Secondary Education ..... 2 semester hours
- *3. Materials and Methods ..... 2 semester hours
- 4. Observation and Directed Teaching (one or both fields) ..... 3 semester hours
- 5. Electives ..... 9 semester hours

II. The subject matter requirements for the teaching of any subject shall be:
- 1. For English ..... 24 semester hours
  - This shall include:
    - a. Grammar, Composition, and Rhetoric
    - b. American Literature
    - c. English Literature

NOTE: It is recommended that each applicant present credit for at least six semester hours in each subdivision of English shown above with a total of not less than 30 semester hours in English.

- 2. For French ..... 18 semester hours

This is based on two units of entrance credit in French. If no entrance credit is presented, the applicant must have 24 semester hours, or 18 hours in addition to Elementary French.

The requirements for certification in any other modern foreign language will be the same as to entrance and college credits as for the teaching of French.

NOTE: It is recommended that the applicant have from 6 to 12 semester hours more credit in the Language to be taught than that represented by the minimum.

NOTE: Students interested in fulfilling the requirements for a college degree should refer to pages 13-14.

* Credit for Materials and Methods required only in one subject.

† General Psychology will not be accepted as a part of the professional work on any certificate.

3. For History ..... 24 semester hours
   This shall include:
   a. Ancient and Mediæval
   b. Modern European
   c. United States
   } ..... 12 semester hours
   d. Political Science or Government ..... 3 semester hours
   e. Electives from:
      (1) Economics
      (2) Sociology
      (3) North Carolina History
      (4) From a, b, c, and d above ..... 9 semester hours

NOTE: It is recommended that the History teacher have not less than 36 semester hours, including 24 semester hours in History, with at least 6 semester hours in each subdivision in that subject, with 6 hours in Political Science and Economics and with 6 semester hours in Geography.

4. For Latin ..... 24 semester hours

This is based on two units of entrance credit in Latin, to be reduced six semester hours for each additional unit of entrance credit.

NOTE: It is recommended that each applicant for a Latin certificate show credit for at least three years of college work in that subject.

5. For Mathematics ..... 15 semester hours

NOTE: Additional credit for six semester hours in Mathematics would be desirable.

6. For Science ..... 30 semester hours
   This shall include:
   a. Biology
   b. Chemistry
   c. Physics
   d. Geography or Geology

A certificate to teach any one science, e.g., Biology, may be secured by presenting credit for a minimum of 30 semester hours in science, including a major in the particular science in which the certificate is desired.

NOTE: It is recommended that the science teacher have credit for at least 36 semester hours, with not less than six semester hours in any one of the four sciences.

7. For Commerce ..... 36 semester hours
   This shall include:
   a. Stenography
   b. Typewriting
   c. Bookkeeping
   d. Office Management
8. For Fine Arts ..... 30 semester hours
9. For Industrial Arts ..... 30 semester hours
10. For Public School Music ..... 30 semester hours

To be qualified to teach Public School Music, as a part of the 30 semester hours or in addition to it, the applicant must have credit for at least three semester hours in Voice. A certificate to teach instrumental music such as Piano or Violin will not require credit in Voice.

11. For Physical Education ..... 30 semester hours
    (Theoretical and Practical)
12. For Home Economics ..... 45 semester hours
    This shall include:
    a. Chemistry ..... 6 semester hours
    b. Physiology and Bacteriology ..... 6 semester hours
    c. Physics ..... 2 semester hours
    d. Art ..... 3 semester hours
    e. Foods ..... 8 semester hours
    f. Clothing ..... 8 semester hours
    g. Management
       Home Management
       Home Management Residence
       Economics of the Home
       } ..... 6 semester hours
    h. Family
       Child Development
       Family and Social Relationships
       Health and Home Nursing
       } ..... 6 semester hours

A certificate to teach foods only will be issued if applicant has credit for 18 semester hours in foods and has met all requirements for the Home Economics Certificate except in Art and Design and Clothing. A certificate to teach Clothing only will be issued if applicant has credit for fifteen semester hours in Clothing and has met all requirements for the Home Economics Certificate except that in Foods.

13. For Agriculture

This certificate will be issued on the basis of a B.S. Degree in Agricultural Education from a recognized school, provided the applicant meets the Professional Requirements as outlined for the teachers of other high school subjects.

VALIDITY AND RENEWAL. A Class A Certificate may be renewed for five years by presenting credit for 6 semester hours of work. After such a renewal, the certificate may be kept in force by teaching for at least two years within a five-year period. A Class A Certificate issued in 1930 or prior thereto may be made a Life Certificate by presenting credit for five years' teaching experience on the Class A Certificate and credit for 6 semester hours' work specializing in Methods and Supervision. For the high school teacher the Methods course should deal with the teaching of one or more subjects in the high school field.

CERTIFICATES FOR TEACHING IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

I. Grammar Grade or Primary Certificate Class A

These certificates require graduation from a standard four-year college. The specific requirements are as follows:

FOR PRIMARY CERTIFICATE CLASS A

1. English ..... 12 S.H.
   a. Composition ..... 6 S.H.
   b. Children's Literature (Primary Grades) ..... 2 S.H.
   c. Elective ..... 4 S.H.
2. American History and Citizenship ..... 6 S.H.
3. Geography, including Nature Study ..... 6 S.H.
4. Fine and Industrial Arts 9 S.H.
   This shall include:
   a. Drawing
   b. Industrial Arts
   c. Music
5. Physical and Health Education ..... 6 S.H.
   This shall include a minimum of:
   a. Physical Education 2 S.H.
   b. Hygiene and Health Education ..... 2 S.H.
6. Education ..... 21 S.H.
   This shall include:
   a. Primary Methods (Reading, Language, Numbers)
   b. Classroom Management
   c. Child Study
   d. Educational Psychology
   e. Observation and Directed Teaching
7. Electives ..... 57 S.H.

FOR GRAMMAR GRADE CERTIFICATE CLASS A

1. English ..... 12 S.H.
   a. Composition ..... 6 S.H.
   b. Children's Literature (Intermediate and Grammar Grade) ..... 2 S.H.
   c. Elective ..... 4 S.H.
2. American History and Citizenship ..... 6 S.H.
3. Geography ..... 6 S.H.
4. Fine and Industrial Arts 9 S.H.
   This shall include:
   a. Drawing
   b. Industrial Arts
   c. Music
5. Physical and Health Education ..... 6 S.H.
   This shall include a minimum of:
   a. Physical Education 2 S.H.
   b. Hygiene and Health Education ..... 2 S.H.
6. Education ..... 21 S.H.
   This shall include:
   a. Grammar Grade Methods (Reading, Language, Arithmetic, Social Science)
   b. Classroom Management
   c. Child Study
   d. Educational Psychology
   e. Educational Measurements
   f. Observation and Directed Teaching
7. Electives ..... 57 S.H.

VALIDITY AND RENEWAL. A Class A Certificate may be renewed for five years by presenting credit for 6 semester hours of work. After such a renewal, the certificate may be kept in force by teaching for at least two years within a five-year period. A Class A Certificate issued in 1930 or prior thereto may be made a Life Certificate by presenting credit for five years' teaching experience on the Class A Certificate and credit for 6 semester hours' work specializing in Methods and Supervision. For the primary and grammar grade teacher the Methods course should deal with subjects in the elementary school.

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BACHELORS' DEGREES

The matter below, taken from the University catalog, is inserted so that correspondence students may select their courses in line with the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, should they desire to do so. The course leading to this degree is designed to provide a general, well-rounded, liberal education. Students who plan to take Music as their major subject should consult the University's General Catalog for information concerning their programs for the freshman and sophomore years. Those interested in other bachelors' degrees should likewise be guided by the University Catalog.

In order to be recommended for the degree a student must pass satisfactorily and in accordance with the qualitative standard in force the work prescribed for the lower division and at least ninety (90) quarter hours in the upper division, including the prescribed subjects listed below and elective subjects in accordance with the requirements stated. In his senior year each student must also pass a comprehensive examination in the department of his major study. At least three quarters within twelve months must be spent in residence before a degree will be granted.

In his first two years the student pursues a more or less definite curriculum, according to the following plan:

(For the A.B. degree)

Freshman Year

Required:
- *English 1-2-3
- *Social Science 1-2-3
- Physical Education 1-2-3
- *Hygiene 1-2-3

Choose one:
- Natural Science 1-2-3
- Chemistry 1-2-3
- Physics 1-2-3
- †Geology 21-22-23

Choose one:
- *Mathematics 1-2-3
- Greek 11-12-13
- *Latin 11-12-13 or 21-22-23

Choose one:
- French 11-12-13
- *German 11-12-13
- Greek 11-12-13
- *Latin 11-12-13 or 21-22-23
- Spanish 11-12-13

Sophomore Year

Required:
- *English 22-23-24
- Foreign Language, 21-22-23 (Continuing the one chosen in the first year.)

---

* Given by correspondence.
† Geology c 41-42 will meet this requirement.

Choose one:

- *Economics 21-22-23
- **Education 41-42
- Political Science 31-32-33
- *History 21-22-23
- ‡History 41-42
- *History 44-45-46
- Philosophy 21-22-23
- §Sociology 21-22-23

Choose one:

- Botany 41 and Zoology 41
- Botany 41 and 43
- Chemistry 1-2-3 or 4-5, or 31 and 41 (or 42)
- Geology 21-22-23 or *41-42
- Physics 21-22-23
- Mathematics 21-22-23
- ***Psychology 21-22-23
- Zoology 41 and 42

In addition choose one free elective—3 hours a week for the year.

Junior and Senior Years

For the purpose of providing the proper concentration for the junior and senior years the subjects of the curriculum have been grouped under several Divisions: the Division of the Humanities, the Division of Natural Science and the Division of Social Science. The Division of Teacher Training, under the direction of the head of the University's Department of Education, has been organized for the purposes of administration, guidance, and program-making in the field of teacher training. At the end of a student's second year he must choose one of the Divisions for his major work during his last two years. Having made his choice his work will be directed by the Chairman of the Division chosen. In general he will be expected to take about one-third of his work in one Department, one-third in allied Departments in the same Division, and one-third elective in other Divisions. It is understood that if no program of a Division meets the needs of a student he may submit a program of his own, which he may follow if it meets with the approval of the Division chosen for his major work.

It is expected that the last year's work will be taken in residence. Special cases will be handled individually.

Before being eligible for a degree, a senior must pass to the satisfaction of his major department, a comprehensive examination in the subject of his major. This examination will normally be given in the winter quarter of the senior year.

NOTE: Persons interested in fulfilling the requirements for a teacher's certificate should refer to pages 9-12, inclusive.

---

* Given by correspondence.
** Education 41 only offered.
*** Credit only for lecture part of course.
‡ History 41 only offered.
§ Sociology c 51-52 will meet this requirement.

The Group-Study Plan

For College Credit

High school graduates and others with some college credit desiring undergraduate degree credit at the University of North Carolina may form a group for study. There should be as many as six interested in the same course. Each individual desiring credit should send his previous school record to the University, unless it is already on file here, and have it approved. Then he should send his application and fee to the Extension Division, upon the receipt of which material will be sent him. The various persons constituting the group may meet, under a local supervisor if desired, and discuss the work, but the assignments submitted for correction must be written by each individual independently of the others. In case a supervisor is secured and charges for his services, he will be paid by the group and not by the Extension Division. His duties will be to arrange a convenient meeting place, set the time for group meetings, and be present to lead the discussions and clear up difficulties which may arise. Members of the faculty at State College in Raleigh also teach correspondence courses carrying credit at that institution. If credit is desired there, or elsewhere, the authorities should be consulted to determine whether the course selected will fit into the curriculum and give the credit desired.

Without Academic Credit

Persons not interested in college credit but desiring to follow a directed plan of study for educational and cultural purposes are advised to proceed as follows: if six or more persons wish to study the same course with little expense, one member of the group should send his application and fee to the Extension Division. This will entitle that person to one set of assignments and the consideration of his papers by an instructor at the institution. (Additional sets of assignments may be secured at a nominal amount, the cost of mimeographing.) The person enrolled may discuss the material with the group, letting the other members have the benefit of the information given and of the instructor's comments on his papers when they are returned corrected. This will be without cost to the group unless the members decide to select a local supervisor who may make a charge for his services. If the group is composed of ten or more, it is advisable for more than one person to enroll so that there will be more of the instructor's comments and suggestions for discussions. Persons need not be high school graduates in order to join the non-credit group.

Adult Education

Those Not Interested in Academic Credit
(See Group Study Plan, above).

Special arrangements will be made with instructors to meet the requirements of adult students who, for various reasons, desire to continue study without securing academic or professional credit. Any mature person or

group of persons, regardless of previous education, may register for any of the subjects listed in this bulletin, and the instructor will endeavor to adjust the course to the individual or group needs and interests. Courses in Psychology, Education, Art, Economics, Rural Economics, Sociology and Hygiene and Health Education are especially recommended for home-makers, social workers and parent-teacher groups. Literary and civic club members will find courses in History, Economics, English, Political Science, foreign languages, Journalism, Art and Music valuable. For business groups there are courses in Accounting, Business English, Mathematics, etc.

For Teachers of Adults

Special attention is called to the courses in Adult Education, Education c130 and c131, designed to meet the in-service training needs of adult education teachers, as well as to meet the needs of persons interested in becoming familiar with the broad field of adult education.

PERSONS FOR WHOM CORRESPONDENCE COURSES ARE DESIGNED

University courses of standard grade by correspondence offer excellent opportunities to many persons who are fully qualified to pursue them profitably but who, for various reasons, are unable to attend a university. Aside from this general appeal, they are particularly helpful to the following classes:

1. College students who are unable to pursue continuous residence courses.
2. School teachers who are working for certification credit.
3. High school graduates who cannot go to college.
4. Professional and business men who wish to supplement their training.
5. The man or woman who left school early or who is too old to go to school and feels the value of broader training to make life more interesting, or who seeks to change his or her vocation.
6. Club women who wish to pursue a systematic line of study.
7. Isolated men and women who desire some interest outside of themselves—who are reaching out for mental stimulus.
8. Housekeepers and homemakers who wish to keep up with the times.
9. Ministers of the gospel laboring in remote places who wish to keep themselves informed in regard to educational matters.
10. Those in public service—in fact all who are eager for knowledge or advancement, and desire to keep abreast of the times.

How to Select and Register for Correspondence Work

Read carefully all the preceding pages. Then look through the list of courses and select one or two which you need or in which you are most interested. Next fill out the application blank in the back of this bulletin; detach and mail it with a check or money order to the University Extension Division, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Before writing to the Division be sure to fill out *every line* of the application blank. If you are a school teacher, be certain to give exact information, where called for, concerning your teacher's certificate; i.e., *kind* (whether elementary, primary, grammar grade, or high school); *class* (whether A, B, or C); and *number*.

Textbooks will not be sent unless requested on the application blank.

COURSES OF INSTRUCTION

NOTE: Unless otherwise stated in the description of the courses, the "c" numbers are the same as in the University catalogue and also correspond to the "s" numbers in the summer school catalogue. For the complete understanding of a course, both the "a" and "b" parts should be taken. For degree credit both parts are required.

NOTE: The fees here listed apply to residents of North Carolina. Fees for non-residents are $10.00 for a half course and $17.50 for a whole course. *In addition* to the course fee, each student (resident and non-resident) must pay at the time of his enrollment one registration fee of $2.00 which shall entitle him to administrative and office service for one year. (See pp. 6-7.)

DEPARTMENT OF ART

c41.
THE HISTORY AND APPRECIATION OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL ART.
MR. KOCH.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

A survey of the architecture, sculpture, and painting from the beginnings of art through the Gothic period.

*c42.
THE HISTORY AND APPRECIATION OF RENAISSANCE ART.
MR. KOCH.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

A survey of the architecture, sculpture, and painting of the Renaissance in Europe from the end of the Gothic period through the Baroque period in Italy, France, Spain, the Netherlands, Germany, and England.

c43.
THE HISTORY AND APPRECIATION OF MODERN ART.
MR. KOCH.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

A survey of the architecture, sculpture, and painting in the western world from the end of the Renaissance to the present day.

DEPARTMENT OF DRAMATIC ART

c50.
SHAKESPEARE.
(See description of this course listed under Department of English.)

c155a.
PLAYWRITING.
PROFESSOR BAILEY AND ASSISTANT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

A practical course in the analysis of the one-act play with emphasis upon technical devices for achieving dramatic effects.

c155b.
PLAYWRITING.
PROFESSOR BAILEY AND ASSISTANT.
Prerequisite, Dramatic Art c155a.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

A practical course in the writing of the one-act play (or the short pageant).

* Available fall 1941.

c156. Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
PLAYWRITING. Fee, $13.50.
PROFESSOR BAILEY AND ASSISTANT. *27 assignments.*
Prerequisite, Dramatic Art c155a-b.
The principles of dramatic construction studied in the analysis of the full-length (three-act) play and applied in the writing of a full-length play.

c157. Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
PLAYWRITING AND CRITICISM. Fee, $13.50.
PROFESSOR BAILEY AND ASSISTANT.
Prerequisite, Dramatic Art c156, except for mature, practising playwrights and by arrangement with the instructor.
Criticism and aid in re-writing on technical and other points to students of mature age and experience. The course involves no exercises or formal assignments and is designed to aid playwrights or teachers faced with the problem of writing full-length pageants or plays. To take the course, the student should have ready to submit at once dramatic work already in process of completion.

c162a-162b. Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
MODERN DRAMA. Fee, $8.00.
MR. WYNN. *16 assignments each.*
The main purpose of this course is to give the student a general acquaintance with the chief tendencies of the English and continental drama of the past forty or forty-five years.

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND COMMERCE

ECONOMICS

c21-c22-c23. Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
GENERAL ECONOMICS. Fee, $8.00 each.
MR. MARTIN OR MR. MEYERS. *18 assignments each.*
Sophomore Elective.
This course is planned to give a general understanding of the organization of our economic life and the fundamental principles underlying it. An analysis is made of production, distribution, and consumption, of the elements which determine value and price, with a brief introduction to money, banking and credit, monopoly, business combinations, transportation, labor problems, and economic reform.

c31-c32. Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
GENERAL ECONOMICS. Fee, $13.50 each.
MR. MARTIN OR MR. MEYERS. *27 assignments each.*
Sophomore Elective.
These courses cover the same material as Economics c21-c22-c23. Persons who have taken Economics c21-c22-c23 should not take these.

c35. Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
ECONOMIC HISTORY. Fee, $13.50.
PROFESSOR HEATH. *27 assignments.*
Sophomore and Junior Elective.
The purpose of this study is to lead the student through the channel of history into the field of modern economy. Our present economic system is presented as a product of evolutionary processes. Special emphasis is placed on the development of the wage system, the ebb and flow of business activity, the expansion of markets, and the growth of capital, etc., as they have manifested themselves in English and American history.

*Commerce

c1a. No credit.
ACCOUNTING. Fee, $12.50.**
Mr. Crutchfield *15 assignments.*
Study of the fundamental principles of double entry bookkeeping; books of original entry; the ledger; preparation of financial statements.

c1b. No credit.
ACCOUNTING. Fee, $12.50.**
Mr. Crutchfield *15 assignments.*
Continuation of c1a; closing and adjusting the books; the work sheet; control accounts; the partnership.

c91-c92. Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
BUSINESS LAW. Fee, $13.50 each.
Professor Hobbs. *27 assignments each*
Prerequisites, Economics 31-32 (or 21-22-23) if taken for credit.
The aim of the course is to give the student an understanding of the main principles of law that govern in the daily conduct of business. The topics discussed are: contracts, agencies, negotiable instruments, sales, bailments, corporations, partnerships, and bankruptcy.

Allied Subjects

***c6.
BUSINESS ENGLISH.
(See description of this course listed under Department of English.)

c51.
BUSINESS ENGLISH.
(See description of this course listed under Department of English.)

cn1.
THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT SERVICE. (Public Administration.)
(See description of this course listed under Department of Political Science.)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

c41. Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF EDUCATION. Fee, $13.50.
Professor Ryan. *27 assignments.*
This is an orientation course in education, especially designed for school teachers, parents, school board members, and the general public. This course attempts to aid teachers in obtaining a general understanding of the philosophy and procedures of modern education with special reference to recent developments in this field.

c71a-c71b. Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY. Fee, $8.00 each.
Professor Jordan. 15 assignments each.
The critical consideration of such topics as original nature of man, heredity versus environment, kinds of learning and factors influencing learning, individual differences, mental hygiene, and mental measurement.

---

* NOTE: Credit courses listed under the Department of Commerce count only toward the S.B. degree in Commerce.
** Fee includes registration fee.
*** Persons working for the S.B. degree in Commerce should take English c51 instead of this course.

c94a-c94b.
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT.
PROFESSOR MCKEE.

Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

A course for teachers on the organization and direction of activities in the classroom as distinguished from the administration of an entire school. Class routine, lesson planning, conduct of the recitation, and extra-curricular activities will be included.

c97a-c97b.
CHILDREN'S LITERATURE.
MISS BEASLEY.

Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

In general, the aim of the course is to acquaint the students with children's reading in order that they may understand the varying appeals that books make to children and thus learn to select books with consideration for the different age groups and differing backgrounds of children. The importance of literature made by children, children's literary tradition, classics, modern and traditional fairy tales, poetry, nursery rhymes, fables and beast tales, myths.

c99a-c99b.
PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF SECONDARY EDUCATION.
PROFESSOR GWYNN.

Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

Theory, objectives and types of organization of secondary education; the curriculum as related to aims of secondary education and modern American life; guidance in the secondary school; theory and procedures of classroom activities; classroom management; modern methods of teaching and measuring results of teaching; extra-curricular activities in secondary schools.

c101a-c101b.
BASIC PRINCIPLES AND TECHNIQUES IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION.
PROFESSOR PHILLIPS.

Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
15 assignments each.

The first half of this course will include the basic principles involved in school administration and is designed particularly for teachers who wish to get a review of the fundamentals of the organization and administration of American public schools, and for students desiring to prepare later for general administrative positions. Attention will be given to the organization, administration, and financial support of public schools in federal, state, and local school districts; work of school boards, retirement and tenure, professional ethics; public relations; and relationships of the teacher in modern educational administration. The second half of the course will deal with practical techniques in educational administration.

c102a-c102b.
THE PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP.
PROFESSOR MCKEE.

Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

The first half of this course considers those problems of the public school principal that have to do with the organization and administration of a school, and with the supervision of the school plant and equipment. The second part concerns those problems of the public school principal that have to do with the improvement of instruction and of the course of study.

c130.
PRINCIPLES AND METHODS IN ADULT EDUCATION.
PROFESSOR MCKEE.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

Consideration will be given in this course to (1) principles in organizing adult study groups; (2) how adults learn, (3) guidance and counselling of adults; (4) preparing curriculum materials for adult groups; and (5) teaching and learning methods and techniques in adult education. It is designed for professional and lay leaders of adults and others interested in the administration and supervision of adult education.

*c131.
ADULT EDUCATION.—A General Survey.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

Consideration will be given in this course to (1) current developments in adult education in the United States and foreign countries; (2) the history and philosophy of adult education; (3) the place of specialized fields in adult education; and (4) problems in managing adult education programs. It is particularly designed for teachers and supervisors in adult education, lay workers, school superintendents and others interested in this field.

c141.
EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH.
PROFESSOR KNIGHT OR ASSISTANT.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
25 assignments.

This course gives a historical survey of education in the Southern states with special attention to its development, organization, administration, and supervision since 1876. Problems in educational reorganization needed for the solution of school problems in the Southern states will be studied.

c142a-c142b.
HISTORIC FOUNDATIONS OF MODERN EDUCATION.
PROFESSOR KNIGHT OR ASSISTANT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

This course traces the development of some of the more important educational problems of modern times as they have been affected by the social and political facts of history, by the contributions of the leading educational theorists, and by institutional practice. It deals with the growth of national systems of education, and especially with the extension of popular education in the United States.

c143a-c143b.
SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES.
PROFESSOR KNIGHT OR ASSISTANT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

The purpose of this course is to present the evolution of the educational practices and institutions of the United States. The elementary school, the secondary school, and the institutions of higher learning will be traced through (a) the period of transplanting of European institutions; (b) the period of modification of institutional life to meet new conditions; and (c) the period of development of an educational system of free common schools, high schools, state universities, and technical schools in harmony with the political and social ideals and institutions of America.

NOTE: This course is accepted as the equivalent of History 170.

* Not offered 1941.

c155.
THE TEACHING OF THE NATURAL SCIENCES IN THE ELEMENTARY GRADES.
PROFESSOR PRESTON.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

The informational content of science is studied in relation to science instruction in the elementary school. Purposes, methods, and materials for such instruction are surveyed. Stress is laid on adjusting teaching to local environments and on making the best use of common things at hand, in demonstrating and experimenting.

c160.
CURRICULUM CONSTRUCTION.
PROFESSOR MCKEE.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

The construction and organization of the elementary school curriculum when based upon human needs. Includes consideration of the teacher's function in curriculum construction, objectives of the school subjects, sources of curricular materials and criteria for evaluating it, selection and organization of the pupil-activities through which the objectives may be obtained. Special attention will be focused upon recent trends in curricular revision and organization in our modern schools.

c164.
TESTS AND MEASUREMENTS IN EDUCATION.
PROFESSOR JORDAN.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
17 assignments.

Methods of measuring and improving the results of instruction in the elementary or high school will be given detailed consideration in this course. Students will be made acquainted with the most important tests and scales and will be given some experience in interpreting the results both statistically and practically.

c170a-c170b.
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.
PROFESSOR MCKEE.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each

The applications of important findings of experimental research and of accepted theories of Psychology to the effective teaching and learning of the materials in the various subject matter fields. Each subject will be treated in relation to its possibilities for the growth and development of socialized personalities, emphasizing both a motivated, constructive approach and a diagnostic remedial attack on pupil's disabilities and difficulties.

c171a-c171b.
GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCHOOL CHILD.
PROFESSOR JORDAN OR ASSISTANT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

(a) Child development. A study of the growth and development of children up to the time of adolescence. Changes in emotions are emphasized as well as those of intellect. (b) Adolescence. A study of the changes in emotions, attitudes and interests which take place during the adolescent years. The underlying physiological changes are, of course, not neglected.

c171a-c171b (Sociology).
EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY.
(See description of this course listed under Department of Sociology.)

ADDITIONAL COURSES

Education

*c3X.
SCHOOL HYGIENE AND HEALTH EDUCATION.
PROFESSOR BEARD.

Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

The elements of normal growth, physical diagnosis, and the essentials of personal health maintenance are studied. The individual child and his environment, posture, neuro-muscular coordination, physical defects, and several phases of personal hygiene are considered. Heating, lighting, and ventilation of school houses and other facts of common school life are discussed.

*c31a-c31b.
INTRODUCTION TO EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY.
PROFESSOR JORDAN OR ASSISTANT.
Sophomore Course.

Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

Education is viewed in this course as a series of changes in individual pupils. The elementary principles of educational psychology will be illustrated and studied briefly through assigned readings, experiments, and discussions.

*c51Pa-c51Pb, c52Ga.
READING AND STUDY HABITS FOR FOR THE ELEMENTARY GRADES.
PROFESSOR MCKEE OR ASSISTANT.

Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each
16 assignments each.

The aim of these courses is to acquaint the student with the materials and methods of teaching reading as a means of extending the experiences of boys and girls, of stimulating good thinking, and arousing interest in a wide variety of reading activities. The chief aim is to train pupils "to translate the printed word into ideals, thoughts, and actions which make for knowledge and efficiency."

*c54Pa, c55Ga.
THE TEACHING OF ARITHMETIC IN THE ELEMENTARY GRADES.
PROFESSOR MCKEE OR ASSISTANT.

Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

These courses deal with the organization and selection of subject matter in arithmetic together with modern methods of teaching this subject in the elementary school.

*c55Gb.
LANGUAGE ARTS IN THE ELEMENTARY GRADES.
PROFESSOR MCKEE OR ASSISTANT.

Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

A study of means of speaking effectively and pleasingly. Written language, obtaining good form through genuine use, including composition, writing, and spelling. A study will be made of (a) various vocabulary studies, (b) how to encourage pupils to make use of words learned, and (c) how best to measure the results of teaching.

---

* This course is no longer required for a degree at this University but it may be taken for credit on teachers' certificates or for degree credit elsewhere, with the approval of the authorities.

Social Science

*c1Xa.
PROBLEMS OF CITIZENSHIP.
PROFESSOR MCKEE OR ASSISTANT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

The purpose of this course is to furnish the means of instruction and training in the development of those capacities and attitudes desirable in trained and creative citizens. Emphasis will be upon the interrelations of home, school, community, state, and national government.

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

c1-c2-c3.
FRESHMAN ENGLISH.
MR. DAGGETT AND MR. CHILES.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

English c1 consists of intensive reading of prose selections, constant written compositions and progressive exercises, with supplementary exercises where needed. The course has for its object the mastery of the sentence and the relation of sentence structure to paragraph structure. There are further readings and exercises in English c2 with attention centered upon the paragraph and its place in the longer essay. Word study and vocabulary building are integral parts of the course. English c3 is devoted to a study of the essay as a prose form; composition centers upon the writing of longer essays, letters, and expositions. Extensive reading is introduced and an approach to the problems of the study of literature is undertaken.

c6.
BUSINESS ENGLISH.
MR. HARTSELL.
This course is similar to English c51.
Students should not take both courses.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
17 assignments.

c22-c23-c24.
ENGLISH LITERATURE.
MR. HARTSELL, Eng. c22-c23;
MR. DAGGETT, Eng. c24.
Prerequisite, English 1-2-3.
Sophomore requirement.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
18 assignments, c22.
20 assignments, c23.
17 assignments, c24.

An introduction to English literature through the study of representative works of selected chief writers. The selections studied in English c22 are drawn from the beginnings of English literature through the eighteenth century. Those in English c23 are drawn from the beginnings of Romanticism through the nineteenth century. In English c24 short stories are studied.

c50.
SHAKESPEARE
PROFESSOR SHARPE.
Sophomore, junior, and senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A study of Shakespeare's plays. About twenty representative comedies, tragedies, and histories will be studied.

c51.
BUSINESS ENGLISH.
MR. HARTSELL.
Prerequisite, English 1-2-3.
Sophomore, junior, and senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A course in the vocabulary, forms, and literature of the business profession with special attention to letters of application and inquiry;

* This course is no longer required for a degree at this University but it may be taken for credit on teachers' certificates or for degree credit elsewhere, with the approval of the authorities.

routine, collection, adjustment and sales letters, business reports, and technical articles. Specimen letters are studied and criticized and actual business problems solved through written work.

c53. CREATIVE WRITING: THE SHORT STORY.
MR. WILSON OR ASSISTANT.
Junior and senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A composition course designed primarily to offer to students an opportunity for short story writing and to familiarize them with the form. The work of various European and American authors will be studied.

NOTE: Those who have not had a course equivalent to English c54a are advised to take that course first.

c54a. INTRODUCTION TO THE SHORT-STORY.
MR. DAGGETT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
17 assignments.

An analysis of numerous short story materials and techniques. Introductory to English c53.

NOTE: This course was formerly called English c9.

c54. CREATIVE WRITING. THE SHORT STORY (Advanced).
Prerequisite, English c53 or the equivalent.
MR. WILSON OR ASSISTANT.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

The major aim of this course is to discover and develop the creative writing abilities of students in the planning and preparing of short stories. It endeavors to do this by a minute study and analysis of outstanding stories, of the methods that have proved successful for specific purposes by other writers and by applying the results of such analysis to the student's writing.

c81. AMERICAN LITERATURE.
DR. HORNER.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A survey of American literature from 1830 to 1855, with especial attention to Poe, Emerson, Thoreau, Lowell, Hawthorne, and Melville.

c84. ENGLISH LITERATURE, 1780-1830.
PROFESSOR HUDSON.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A course in the literature of the English Romantic Period, the purpose of which is to acquaint the student with the best thought and feeling of the time. Especial attention is given to the greater poets, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Scott, Byron, Shelley, and Keats.

c91. THE ENGLISH NOVEL.
MR. CHILES.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

This is a course in the development of the English novel, particularly in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Special attention is given to the works of Jane Austen, Scott, Dickens, Thackeray, Charlotte Brontë, and George Eliot.

c155a-c155b, c156, c157.
PLAYWRITING.
(See description of these courses listed under Department of Dramatic Art.)

c162a-c162b.
MODERN DRAMA.
(See description of these courses listed under Department of Dramatic Art.)

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY

Geology

c41-c42.
INTRODUCTION TO GENERAL GEOLOGY.
PROFESSOR PROUTY.
Sophomore, junior, and senior electives.

Credit, 4 semester hrs. or 6 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
Lab. fee, $1.00 each.
27 assignments each.

c41. Dynamical Geology. This course deals with the physical and dynamical geology of the earth. The composition, structure, and physical changes of the earth are studied as well as the natural processes that are at work modifying both the face of the earth and the deeper crust.
c42. Historical Geology. A broad study of the geological history of the earth and its inhabitants, as revealed chiefly in earth records. A scientific and cultural course. Laboratory materials used in these courses will be furnished by the Extension Division.

Geography

c3c. (Natural Science 3c).
ELEMENTARY GEOGRAPHY.
Freshman requirement for those expecting to go into the School of Commerce.
PROFESSOR EMORY.

Credit, 2 2/3 semester hrs. or 4 quarter hrs.
Fee*
20 assignments.

Elements of geography with emphasis on: place location, the basic principles accounting for climates and man's activities peculiar to the important climatic regions, a brief survey of earth materials for an understanding of the location and occurrence of important natural resources, a summary indicating the influence of these elements on present economic life. Students taking this course by correspondence will be required to take the Place Geography examination at Chapel Hill. This examination is given at the middle and at the end of each quarter, as well as during each term of summer school, or it may be taken at other times upon payment of a special examination fee of two dollars.

c15a-c15b.
PRINCIPLES OF GEOGRAPHY.
PROFESSOR EMORY OR PROFESSOR ERICKSON.

Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

The interrelationship of man and his geographic environment. The geographic factors, particularly climate, are discussed in relation to their influence on the activities of man. Illustrative material is so chosen as to give the student a comprehensive world view. A first course in college geography.

c31.
INTRODUCTION TO GEOGRAPHY.
PROFESSOR ERICKSON.

Credit, 2 2/3 semester hrs. or 4 quarter hrs.
Fee*
20 assignments.

This course, primarily for freshmen and sophomores, is a part of the basic course in Elementary Geography (Geography 31-32-33). It is a regional study of the principles underlying the climate, relief, native vegetation, soils, and distribution of minerals and metals of the world.

* The fee for residents is $10.75 and that for non-residents $13.00, in addition to the registration fee. See page 6.

c51-c52.
INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL GEOGRAPHY.
PROFESSOR EMORY OR PROFESSOR ERICKSON.
Junior and senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
26 assignments each.
The course deals with man's interaction with his varying environment in the development of industries, and with the geographic conditions of different countries as giving rise to commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF GERMANIC LANGUAGES

c3-c4.
GERMAN: INTERMEDIATE COURSE.
PROFESSOR COENEN OR ASSISTANT.
Freshman and sophomore elective.
Prerequisite, one full year of German.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
27 assignments each.
Translation, sight reading, composition and grammar.

c11-c12-c13.
GERMAN: INTERMEDIATE COURSE.
PROFESSOR COENEN OR ASSISTANT.
Freshman and sophomore elective.
Prerequisite, one full year of German.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
18 assignments each.
Practically the same material is covered in these courses as in c3-c4. Students may not take both for credit.

c21.
ADVANCED GERMAN. (Introduction to the history of German literature.)
PROFESSOR COENEN OR ASSISTANT.
Sophomore, junior, and senior elective.
Prerequisites, German 3-4 or one year of college German.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.
Lessing: *Minna von Barnhelm;* Schiller: *Die Jungfrau von Orleans.*

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

c1-c2-c3.
SOCIAL SCIENCE.
PROFESSOR PEGG.
Required of Freshmen.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
17 assignments each.
A general course dealing with the fundamental factors in modern civilization in Europe and the United States. An historical study of the institutions of western civilization, designed to promote an understanding of the social, political, and economic aspects of the modern world.

c21-c22-c23.
AMERICAN HISTORY.
PROFESSOR GREEN.
Sophomore elective.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
19 assignments, c21.
18 assignments, c22.
17 assignments, c23.
A general survey of the history of the United States. The first course carries the story from Columbus's discovery of America to about 1843, the second from this point to 1897 and the third covers approximately the last four decades.

NOTE: These courses were formerly called History c47-c48-c49.

c41.
ANCIENT HISTORY.
PROFESSOR CALDWELL.
Sophomore, Junior, and Senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.
A course dealing with the history of the Orient, Greece, and Rome to the time of Constantine. Particular attention will be paid to social and economic conditions, and cultural and religious developments.

c44-c45-c46.
ENGLISH HISTORY.
PROFESSOR RUSSELL.
Sophomore Elective.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

The purpose of this course is to convey a good working knowledge of English history and broaden it into a survey of the part the Anglo-Saxon race has played in world history. The first part considers early times to the Lancestrian Revolution (1399), the second covers the period 1399 to the end of the Stuart Period (1714) and the last concerns the period 1714 to the present.

c71-c72.
AMERICAN HISTORY.
PROFESSOR GREEN.
Junior-senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
27 assignments each.

A general survey of the history of the United States. The first course begins with Columbus's discovery of America and goes to the end of the Civil War; the second begins at this point and ends in the mid-nineteen-thirties. Both c21-c22-c23 and c71-c72 may not be taken for credit.

NOTE: These courses were formerly called History c47-c48.

*c143.
DIPLOMATIC HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES, 1776-1940.
PROFESSOR JOHNSON.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A study of American foreign relations with emphasis upon the historical development of present foreign policies and the social and economic forces at home and abroad which led to their adoption.

c161.
NORTH CAROLINA, 1584-1815.
PROFESSOR LEFLER.
Junior-senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A survey of the political, social, economic and cultural development of North Carolina from the first settlement until 1815.

c162.
NORTH CAROLINA, 1815-1936.
PROFESSOR NEWSOME.
Junior-senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A survey of political, economic, social and cultural development in North Carolina since 1815.

c170a-c170b.
SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES.
(See description of these courses listed under Department of Education.)

NOTE: Those who have taken Education c37a-b or c143a-b in previous years should not take these courses.

DEPARTMENT OF JOURNALISM

**c1.
WRITING PUBLICITY FOR CLUBS.
PROFESSOR SPEARMAN.
Non-credit.
Fee.**
10 assignments.

This course is especially designed for club and other organization press chairmen who wish to secure newspaper publicity for their

* Available 1942.
** The fee for Journalism c1 is $7.50 for non-residents and $5.00 for residents, in addition to a registration fee of $1.00. A person who registers for Journalism only and within the year registers for another course will pay in addition to the course fee only $1.00 to complete the usual registration fee of $2.00.

group activities. Instruction will be given in the gathering and the writing of news, reporting of meetings and speeches, handling of feature stories and interviews, and general information on the relationship of club chairmen with the press. The close study of local newspapers and the actual writing of news will be stressed.

DEPARTMENT OF LATIN

c1x.
READINGS IN ROMAN LITERATURE.
MR. SUSKIN.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
25 assignments.

This course is concerned with the translating of Latin, with work in vocabulary, and with a review of the principles of grammar.

c8.
LATIN COMPOSITION.
PROFESSOR SANDERS.
Junior and senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
28 assignments.

The course will begin with translation into Latin of detached sentences illustrating the general principles of syntax and word order; the second half will deal with continuous narrative and with questions of diction and style.

c11-c12-c13.
INTERMEDIATE LATIN.
MR. SUSKIN.
Freshman and sophomore elective.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

The courses consist of readings in classical authors, including Cicero and Vergil.

c26.
LATIN POETRY.
PROFESSOR SANDERS.
Sophomore elective.
Prerequisites, Latin 1-2-3 or 11-12-13, or the equivalent.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

The course comprises the reading of the Phormio of Terence and selected odes of Horace. Emphasis is put on content of literary form.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

NOTE: Either Mathematics c1-c2-c3 or c7-c8 will meet the requirements of the freshman year.

c1.
INTRODUCTORY MATHEMATICS.
PROFESSOR LINKER OR PROFESSOR HOYLE.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
18 assignments.

This course is the equivalent of Mathematics 1 in residence and treats the basic problems of algebra. It is a shorter course than Mathematics c7 and consists of selected topics in college algebra.

c2.
INTRODUCTORY MATHEMATICS.
PROFESSOR CAMERON.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
18 assignments.

This course is the equivalent of Mathematics 2 in residence. It consists of a study of functions and their graphs, the limit notion, graphical treatment of rates, means, ordinates, maximum and minimum, areas, etc.—an introduction to the notions of the differential and integral calculus.

c3.
TRIGONOMETRY.
PROFESSOR LASLEY.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
17 assignments.

This course is the equivalent of Mathematics 3 in residence and is

designed primarily for A.B. students. It gives a somewhat shorter course in trigonometry than Mathematics c8, but covers the fundamentals with less extensive applications.

c7. COLLEGE ALGEBRA.
PROFESSOR LINKER AND PROFESSOR HOYLE.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
29 assignments.

This course treats the fundamental operations of algebra and emphasizes the solution of linear and quadratic equations. Graphs are especially stressed. Determinants are studied in the solution of linear equations.

c8. TRIGONOMETRY.
PROFESSOR LASLEY.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

This course concerns itself with the definitions of the trigonometric functions, their relations to each other, and the application of these functions and log tables to the solution of triangles in the plane.

DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

c1. ELEMENTARY THEORY OF MUSIC.
PROFESSOR HAYDON AND ASSISTANT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

A study of the rudiments of music. Scales, intervals, and elementary harmonic material with practice in melody writing.

c14-c15-c16. HARMONY.
PROFESSOR SCHINHAN.
Prerequisite, Music c4, or the equivalent.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
15 assignments, c14.
16 assignments, c15.
18 assignments, c16.

A first-year course in harmony. This covers the ordinary harmonic resources up to the chords of the seventh, their inversions, and elementary modulation.

c24-c25-c26. HISTORY OF MUSIC.
MR. KLENZ.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

This general course in history of music is divided into three parts any one of which may be taken separately: (1) the period from antiquity to the end of the sixteenth century; (2) the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; (3) from the Romantic period to the present day. It is planned to include phonographic recordings of the music of the various periods.

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Hygiene

*c1-c2-c3. PERSONAL HYGIENE.
PROFESSOR SCHNELL.
Required of Freshmen.
Credit 2/3 semester hr. or 1 quarter hr. each.
Fee.*
6 assignments each.

This course is designed to acquaint the student with the fundamental facts of personal hygiene so that he may keep his body at its highest efficiency. It is intended also to show the student how the individual

* The fee for Hygiene c1-c2-c3 is $3.50 each for non-residents and $3.00 each for residents, in addition to a registration fee of $1.00. A person who registers for one of these courses only and within the year registers for another course will pay in addition to the course fee only $1.00 to complete the usual registration fee of $2.00.

and the community are protected against communicable diseases and to give him knowledge by means of which he may help in promoting health and social betterment.

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

c51. THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES.
PROFESSOR JENKINS.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A general course dealing with the national government of the United States. Attention will be directed to the constitutional basis, the historical development, and the practical organization and operation of the institutions established for administering national affairs.

c52. THE GOVERNMENTS OF EUROPE.
PROFESSOR ROBSON.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A course in comparative government dealing with the governments of England, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia up to the beginning of World War II. Particular attention will be directed to the features in the structure, operation and trends in these governments which present contrasts to those in the United States.

c81. AMERICAN STATE GOVERNMENT.
PROFESSOR JENKINS.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A study in the principles, organization, and administrative methods of state government. In connection with the course will be a special study of the government of North Carolina.

Public Administration

cn1. THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT SERVICE.
MR. HAWLEY.
Non-credit.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

This course is designed to assist persons engaged in public employment service and unemployment compensation work to increase their knowledge and to prepare persons for taking certain of the merit examinations given periodically by the Unemployment Compensation Commission.

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

*c21x-c22x-c23x. GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY.
MR. ROGERS.
Junior and senior elective.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

The aim of the course is to present the essential phenomena of psychology, and the various methods of approach. Emphasis is placed on the organic relationships within the whole field.

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES

NOTE: Candidates for degree credit at the University are required to take their courses in this department in residence.

FRENCH

c3. COMPOSITION AND READING—INTERMEDIATE.
PROFESSOR LYONS.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

It is understood that those who register for this course have had

* Credit only for lecture part of course.

either two years of high school French or one year of college French. The course consists of composition of medium difficulty, a thorough review of the essentials of French grammar, and translation, from French into English, of literary masterpieces of moderate difficulty. No pretense is made that the student will improve his knowledge of the spoken language in this course. However, a student who completes successfully this course and the following courses, French c4, should be able to write French with a certain amount of facility, and should be able to read with ease anything written in modern French prose.

c4.
COMPOSITION AND READING—ADVANCED.
PROFESSOR LYONS.
Prerequisites, French 1, 2, and 3 in residence, or one year of college French.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

The objects of this course are: (1) to enable the student to read standard French fluently and easily in preparation for the courses in literature that follow, and (2) to give the student practice in expressing his thoughts in French, thus enabling him to write the language with some degree of fluency. The assignments will consist of constant reading of the masterpieces of modern French literature with frequent compositions.

c21-c22.
FRENCH LITERATURE.
PROFESSOR LYONS.
Prerequisites, French 3-4 or 11-12-13 or the equivalent.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
27 assignments each.

French c21 is an introduction to the study of French literature, giving a general survey of French literature from its beginnings through the 17th century. A number of plays of Corneille, Racine, and Molière, the three great dramatists of the 17th century, will be read. French c22 is a survey of French literature through the 18th and 19th centuries. Selected reading from the works of Voltaire, Rousseau, Beaumarchais, Chateaubriand, and Victor Hugo will be required.

SPANISH

c3-c4.
SPANISH COMPOSITION.
MR. MCKNIGHT.
Prerequisites, either two years of high school or one year of college Spanish.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
27 assignments each.

The object of these courses is to provide the student with an opportunity to acquire practice in writing Spanish.

c21-c22.
SPANISH LITERATURE.
MR. MCKNIGHT.
Prerequisites, Spanish 3-4 or 11-12-13 or the equivalent.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
27 assignments, c21.
20 assignments, c22.

Spanish c21 is a general survey of Spanish literature during the 16th and 17th centuries, with some reference to preceding literary movements. There is the reading of selections from Lope de Vega, Cervantes, Calderón, etc. Spanish c22 gives a general survey of Spanish literature since the classical period, with special stress on the 19th century.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

c51. Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
INTRODUCTION TO SOCIOLOGY. Fee, $13.50.
PROFESSOR BROOKS. *27 assignments.*
Sophomore, junior, and senior elective.
Emphasis on social organization as found in primitive society; the rise of contemporary society; the forces shaping society studied through the geographical, biological, psychological, and cultural approaches; social organization, control, social trends and social changes. Brief consideration of causal factors underlying social problems. This course should precede all other work in this department.

c52a-c52b. Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
SOCIAL PROBLEMS. Fee, $8.00 each.
PROFESSOR MEYER AND ASSISTANT. *16 assignments each.*
These are general courses giving primary emphasis to positive features and institutional foundations of society. Problems of leadership, race, population, family, immigration, and other institutions are emphasized. More emphasis is given in c52b to such pathological aspects of society as crime, poverty, and the defective.

c161a-c161b. Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
THE FAMILY. Fee, $8.00 each.
DR. KLAISS AND ASSISTANT. *15 assignments each.*
The first part deals with the historic significance of the family; its place and problems today under the influence of changing social and economic conditions; some criteria of family success; the family as a field for research. In c161b family relationships are examined in the light of psychological, sociological, legal, eugenic, educational, and economic influences with special emphasis on parent-child factors.

NOTE: In special cases and by permission, c161b may be taken independently of c161a, but ordinarily they should be studied in the order listed.

*c171a-c171b. Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY. Fee, $8.00 each.
PROFESSOR BLACKWELL. *16 assignments each.*
A study of the history and function of education in various societies. The rôle of education in contemporary American democracy. The significance of resources, community and regional backgrounds in education. The social significance of the changing curriculum; school-community relationships; the equipment and rôle of the teacher in societal development. The social studies.

c173a-b. Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
PLAY AND RECREATION. Fee, $8.00 each.
PROFESSOR MEYER. *16 assignments each.*
The theories of play, play activities, attitudes, history of the play movement, play leadership, programs, values, sex and age differences, classification of movements, application to community life. A helpful bibliography is studied.

c175. Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES. Fee, $8.00.
PROFESSOR MEYER. *16 assignments.*
Clubs, student participation in school government, physical education, publicity in school publications, commencement, many miscellaneous topics, theoretical and practical studies of institutions promoting successful programs, bibliographical materials.

* Not available 1941.

c181a-c181b.
REGIONAL SOCIOLOGY OF THE SOUTH.
PROFESSOR BROOKS.
Prerequisite, Sociology 51.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
15 assignments each.

An introductory study of the South as a region showing geographic, population, and sociological factors and trends. Special emphasis is placed upon methods and techniques of investigation of social and regional situations by the use of the genetic, case, and statistical approaches. The study will be based upon the book, *Southern Regions of the United States*, a comprehensive study by Howard W. Odum.

c182.
THE COOPERATIVE MOVEMENT.
PROFESSOR BROOKS.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

The sociology of cooperation; analysis and interpretation with emphasis upon cooperative organization in the modern western world; origins and functioning in nations, regions, and in connection with the basic social institutions; cooperative origins in primitive mutual aid down to the highly organized form of cooperations; the evolution of cooperation in theory, process, and practice; the place of cooperation in a maturing civilization in contrast to, and in comparison with, conflict and various "isms".

c185.
THE NEGRO.
DR. JOHNSON.
Junior and senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A study of the Negro in American life. A brief survey of the historical background is followed by a detailed study of the various aspects of Negro life—economic, religious, educational, health, family, crime, literature, etc.—ending with a consideration of racial attitudes and race relations.

RURAL SOCIAL ECONOMICS

c51.
RURAL ECONOMICS.
PROFESSOR HOBBS.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
25 assignments.

This is a technical course introducing the student to the subject of agricultural economics. It deals with such subjects as the scope of agricultural economics, systems of farming, farm financing, power and machinery, labor, land, tenancy, credits, marketing of farm products, price of farm products, etc. The purpose is to acquaint the student with agriculture as a business, and to introduce him to the new field of agricultural economy.

c53.
HISTORY OF AGRICULTURE.
PROFESSOR HOBBS.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

This course outlines the history of agriculture and rural life, mainly in Europe and America. From the beginning of time man has lived largely on the farm and has extracted his living out of the soil. Urbanization is a recent development. This course is designed to acquaint the student with the stages of agricultural development from the earliest recorded times to the present. It covers earliest beginnings, agriculture in Rome and Greece, later agricultural and rural conditions in Europe, and a brief history of American agriculture. It enables one to understand history better.

c71. RURAL SOCIOLOGY.
PROFESSOR HOBBS.

Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

This course is an introduction to the study of rural sociology. It is based on definite text materials and therefore is generally technical in character, serving to lay a foundation for further study in this field. It deals with such subjects as rural and urban communities defined, types of rural communities, advantages and disadvantages of farm life, rural health and sanitation, rural social institutions as the home, school, church, and government.

c101. NORTH CAROLINA: ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL.
PROFESSOR HOBBS.

Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

This course is designed to familiarize the student with the home state. It is an economic and social interpretation of North Carolina, and is designed mainly for teachers whose work involves a knowledge of the state. It outlines the geographic areas of the state, their economic foundations, peculiar social conditions, and problems. It covers population, agriculture, resources, industry, and state-wide social and economic conditions.

CORRESPONDENCE COURSES OFFERED AT STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND ENGINEERING, RALEIGH, N. C.

Agriculture

Courses	*Credits*
A. H. 202—Animal Nutrition I	3 term hours
A. H. 361—Animal Nutrition II	3 term hours
A. H. 313—Sheep Production	3 term hours
Hort. 313—Home Floriculture	3 term hours
Hort. 303—Vegetable Production	3 term hours
Poul. 201—General Poultry	3 term hours
Poul. 333—Poultry Nutrition	3 term hours
Poul. 401—Poultry Diseases	3 term hours

Agricultural Economics—Rural Sociology

Agr. Econ. 303—Farm Management	3 term hours
Rural Soc. 302—Rural Sociology	3 term hours

Art

A. E. 205a—History of Architecture	2 term hours
A. E. 205b—History of Architecture	2 term hours
A. E. 205c—History of Architecture	2 term hours

Education

Ed. 303a—Educational Psychology	3 term hours
Ed. 303b—Educational Psychology	3 term hours
Ed. 471—Psychology of the Exceptional Pupil	3 term hours
Ed. 476—Psychology of Adolescence	3 term hours
Ed. 420—Vocational Guidance	3 term hours
Ed. 508—Vocational Education	3 term hours
Ed. 424—Occupational Studies	3 term hours
Ed. 452—Industrial Arts	3 term hours
H. E. Ex. 101—Accidents and their Prevention	3 term hours

Economics

Econ. 201—General Economics	3 term hours
Econ. 202—General Economics	3 term hours
Econ. 307—Business Law	3 term hours
Econ. 337—Executive and Personal Development	3 term hours

English

Eng. 211—Business English	3 term hours
Eng. 265—Survey of American Literature	3 term hours
Eng. 266—Survey of American Literature	3 term hours

Geology

Geol. 120a—Physical Geology	3 term hours
Geol. Ex. 207A—Physical Geography	3 term hours
Geol. Ex. 207B—Physical Geography	3 term hours

History

Hist. Ex. 101—American Economic History to 1789	3 term hours
Hist. Ex. 102—American Economic History, 1789-1865	3 term hours
Hist. Ex. 103—American Economic History Since 1865	3 term hours
Hist. 200—The Colonial Period of American History	3 term hours
Hist. 201—History of the United States from the Revolution to the Civil War	3 term hours
Hist. 202—American National Development, 1860-1920	3 term hours

Courses	*Credits*
Hist. 204—Modern European History, 1500-1815	3 term hours
Hist. 205—Modern European History, 1815-1870	3 term hours
Hist. 206—Contemporary Europe	3 term hours
Hist. 207—Modern European History, 1815-1940	3 term hours
Hist. 303—History of North Carolina	3 term hours
Hist. 307—Economic and Social History of the South	3 term hours
Hist. 308—Economic and Social History of the South	3 term hours
Hist. 309—Economic and Social History of the South	3 term hours
Hist. 310—American Biography	3 term hours
Hist. 321—The Hispanic American Republics	3 term hours

Political Science

Pol. Sc. 200—American National Government	3 term hours
Pol. Sc. 201—State Government and Administration	3 term hours
Pol. Sc. 202—Municipal Government and Administration	3 term hours
Pol. Sc. 203—American Political Parties	3 term hours

Engineering

Cer. E. 102—Ceramic Materials	3 term hours
Cer. E. 103—Ceramic and Mining Processes	3 term hours
Cer. E. 201—Drying Fundamentals and Practice	3 term hours
Cer. E. 252—Firing Fundamentals and Practice	3 term hours
Cer. E. 252b—Setting Heavy Clay Products	No credit
Cer. E. 301—Bodies, Glazes and Colors	3 term hours
Cer. E. 302—Metal Enamels	3 term hours
Cer. E. 305—Pyrometry	1 term hour
M. E. 101, 102, 103, or 105, 106—Engineering Drawing	6 term hours
H. E. Ex. 101—Accidents and their Prevention	3 term hours

Practical Technical Correspondence Courses

Radio	No credit
Industrial Electricity	No credit
Mechanical Drawing	No credit
Land Surveying	No credit
Plumbing	No credit
Building and Estimating	No credit
Sheet Metal Pattern Drafting	No credit

Modern Languages

M. L. 101—Elementary French	3 term hours
M. L. 101b or 102—Elementary French	3 term hours
M. L. 101c or 201—Elementary French	3 term hours
M. L. 103a or 105—Elementary Spanish	3 term hours
M. L. 103b or 106—Elementary Spanish	3 term hours
M. L. 103c or 205—Elementary Spanish	3 term hours
M. L. 103, 104—Elementary German	3 or 6 term hours
M. L. 209a—Spanish Prose	3 term hours
M. L. 209b—Spanish Prose	3 term hours
M. L. 209c—Spanish Prose	3 term hours

Psychology

Psy. 200—Introduction to Psychology	3 term hours
Psy. 290—Social Psychology—the Psychology of Social Change	3 term hours
Psy. 291—Psychology of Personality	3 term hours
Psy. 303a—Educational Psychology	3 term hours
Psy. 303b—Educational Psychology	3 term hours
Psy. 471—Psychology of the Exceptional Pupil	3 term hours
Psy. 476—Psychology of Adolescence	3 term hours

Courses	Sociology	*Credits*
Soc. 101—Human Relations		2 term hours
Soc. 102—Human Relations		2 term hours
Soc. 103—Human Relations		2 term hours
Soc. 202—General Sociology		3 term hours
Soc. 203—General Sociology		3 term hours
Soc. 400—Criminology		3 term hours
Soc. 401—Social Pathology		3 term hours
Soc. Ex. 402—Sociology of City Life		3 term hours
Soc. 406—The Family Organization		3 term hours
Rural Soc. 302—Rural Sociology		3 term hours
	Zoology	
Zool. Ex. 108—Heredity and Eugenics		3 term hours

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SERVICES

In addition to the correspondence courses listed in this catalogue, the University of North Carolina offers, through the Extension Division, the following services to the people of the state:

Art. The North Carolina School Art Exhibition is conducted annually in cooperation with The Woman's College of the University of North Carolina and the North Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs. Circulating art exhibits may be secured on a loan basis. A summer institute is held at Blue Ridge, N. C.

Audio-Visual Aids. Sound and silent educational films, lantern slides, recordings and other teaching aids are loaned to schools, colleges, and community organizations. A special catalog of this service may be obtained upon request.

Dramatic Art. Assistance is given in organization for dramatic activities, in play selection and production, and in the loan of playbooks and other library material. An annual tournament is conducted in cooperation with the Carolina Dramatic Association.

Extension Class Instruction. Late afternoon, evening, and Saturday classes are organized wherever enough enrollments to cover expenses are secured. Courses of both a vocational and cultural nature are offered, with college credit, if desired.

Interscholastic Activities. In cooperation with several University departments and state agencies, the Division conducts annual contests in debating, athletics, and academic subjects. A coaching school is held each summer for high school coaches and athletic directors.

Lectures. Popular and technical lectures and readings by members of the faculty are arranged for schools, clubs, and other community organizations. Lecture courses either on a particular subject or a series of topics may be obtained.

Library Service. Reading courses, books, and reference materials are loaned to individuals and groups interested in the systematic study and discussion of literary, historical, social, and other subjects. There are avail-

able about one hundred outlines for study suitable for women's clubs or other groups.

Postgraduate Medical Courses. Each year a series of clinics and lectures is conducted for practicing physicians at two or more centers.

Public Forums. In cooperation with the State Department of Public Instruction, the Extension Division conducts a public forum program, the purpose of which is to stimulate study and discussion of public affairs as a means of extending civic knowledge and strengthening democracy.

Radio. The University Radio Studio produces several series of educational and entertainment programs that are broadcast weekly through the facilities of ten or more commercial radio stations.

Short Courses and Institutes. Short Courses and Institutes are held at the University for groups interested in intensive training and instructional programs.

Summer Courses for High School Students. The Extension Division in cooperation with the Department of Music conducts the annual "All State High School Music Course" at Chapel Hill during the first term of the University Summer Session. The Annual Summer Session in Dramatic Art for high school students is sponsored jointly by the Division and the Department of Dramatic Art.

Summer Study Tours. Courses in geology and geography are offered on motor trips to the Pacific coast, Canada and Mexico, conducted during the months of June, July, and August.

The University News Letter, containing the results of studies made of economic and social conditions in North Carolina, is sent free to residents of the state.

For information about any of the above services, write to the UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION, Chapel Hill, N. C.

REGISTRATION BLANK FOR CORRESPONDENCE COURSES

University Extension Division

Chapel Hill, N. C.

This blank is to be filled out completely in applicant's own handwriting. It must be accompanied by check or money order to cover fee. For course fees for non-residents of North Carolina and registration fee for all, see pages 6-7.

In sending this application, I agree to abide by the rules and regulations of the Extension Division as set down on pages 5 to 35 of the catalog:

1. Name (in full) ..... Age..... Race.....
   (Mr., Miss, or Mrs.)

2. Present address .....
   (City) (County) (State)

3. Permanent address .....

4. Previous education .....

5. If you have ever registered in any division of this University before, underline which division and give date: Residence term.....Summer school .....Extension class..... Correspondence.....

6. Number and subject of course desired.....

7. Kind of credit desired (mark X): Undergraduate degree credit.....
   Toward what degree?.....At what institution?.....
   If credit is desired elsewhere, have you secured the approval of the authorities?
   .....Certification credit.....*Professional credit.
   .....No credit.....Occupation.....

8. If teaching, give KIND of certificate held.....Class.....No.....

9. Do you wish to purchase the books through the Extension Division?.....

* Credit granted teachers for courses in education and allied subjects. See page 9.

REGISTRATION BLANK FOR CORRESPONDENCE COURSES

University Extension Division

Chapel Hill, N. C.

This blank is to be filled out completely in applicant's own handwriting. It must be accompanied by check or money order to cover fee. For course fees for non-residents of North Carolina and registration fee for all, see pages 6-7.

In sending this application, I agree to abide by the rules and regulations of the Extension Division as set down on pages 5 to 35 of the catalog:

1. Name (in full) ..... Age..... (Mr., Miss, or Mrs.) Race.....

2. Present address ..... (City) (County) (State)

3. Permanent address .....

4. Previous education .....

5. If you have ever registered in any division of this University before, underline which division and give date: Residence term.....Summer school .....Extension class..... Correspondence.....

6. Number and subject of course desired.....

7. Kind of credit desired (mark X): Undergraduate degree credit.....

   Toward what degree?.....At what institution?.....

   If credit is desired elsewhere, have you secured the approval of the authorities?

   .....Certification credit.....*Professional credit.

   .....No credit.....Occupation.....

8. If teaching, give KIND of certificate held.....Class.....No.....

9. Do you wish to purchase the books through the Extension Division?.....

---

* Credit granted teachers for courses in education and allied subjects. See page 9.

REGISTRATION BLANK FOR CORRESPONDENCE COURSES

University Extension Division

Chapel Hill, N. C.

This blank is to be filled out completely in applicant's own handwriting. It must be accompanied by check or money order to cover fee. For course fees for non-residents of North Carolina and registration fee for all, see pages 6-7.

In sending this application, I agree to abide by the rules and regulations of the Extension Division as set down on pages 5 to 35 of the catalog:

1. Name (in full) ..... Age..... (Mr., Miss, or Mrs.) Race.....

2. Present address ..... (City) (County) (State)

3. Permanent address .....

4. Previous education .....

5. If you have ever registered in any division of this University before, underline which division and give date: Residence term.....Summer school .....Extension class..... Correspondence.....

6. Number and subject of course desired.....

7. Kind of credit desired (mark X): Undergraduate degree credit.....

   Toward what degree?.....At what institution?.....

   If credit is desired elsewhere, have you secured the approval of the authorities?

   .....Certification credit.....*Professional credit.

   .....No credit.....Occupation.....

8. If teaching, give KIND of certificate held.....Class.....No.....

9. Do you wish to purchase the books through the Extension Division?.....

---

* Credit granted teachers for courses in education and allied subjects. See page 9.

STUDY OUTLINES

EXTENSION BULLETINS

ADVENTURES IN READING SERIES

Current Books of 1923-1924; 1924-1925; 1925-1926. C. S. Love.
Adventures in Reading Series, 1926-1927; 1928-1929. Russell Potter.
Adventures in Reading Series, 1929-1930; 1930-1931. M. N. and R. P. Bond.
Adventures in Reading Series, 1931-1932; 1933. M. N. Bond.

BIOGRAPHY

Other People's Lives, 1928; 1931; 1933. C. S. Love.
Heroes of the American Revolution. 1931. F. M. Green.
Studies in Confederate Leadership. 1931. F. M. Green.

LITERATURE: SOUTHERN, AMERICAN, AND FOREIGN TRANSLATIONS

Contemporary Southern Literature. 1928. H. M. Jones.
Southern Literature. 1926. Addison Hibbard.
The South in Contemporary Literature. 1930. Addison Hibbard.
Recent Poetry from the South. 1928. Addison Hibbard.
Twentieth Century American Literature. 1933. M. N. Bond.
Our Heritage: A Study Through Literature of the American Tradition. 1927. J. H. Hanford.
American Literature. 1927. Addison Hibbard.
Folklore. 1929. R. S. Boggs.
Development of the Short Story: English and American. 1926. L. B. Wright.
The French Novel in English Translation. 1930. U. T. Holmes.
Contemporary Spanish Literature in English Translation. 1929. A. B. and N. B. Adams.

HISTORY

Studies in the History of North Carolina. 1923. R. D. W. Connor.
Romance of the Western Frontier. 1932. F. M. Green.
Modern Russia. 1932. E. E. and E. E. Ericson.
South America. 1929. W. W. Pierson, Jr., and C. S. Love.
The Far East. (China, Japan, and Korea.) 1931. J. A. Robertson.

DRAMA

A Study Course in Modern Drama. 1927. E. L. Green.
American One-Act Plays. 1929. E. T. Rockwell.
International One-Act Plays. 1926. E. T. Rockwell.
A Study of Shakespeare. 1926. Russell Potter.

ART, MUSIC, SCIENCE, TRAVEL

American Artists and Southern Artists of Note. 1929. M. deB. Graves.
Art History. 1930. M. deB. Graves.
Modern French Art. 1927. Russell Potter.
Great Composers. 1925. P. J. Weaver.
America and Her Music. 1931. Lamar Stringfield.
Everyday Science. 1933. C. E. Preston.
Books of Travel. 1931. U. T. Holmes.

Single copies, 50 cents; (In North Carolina, 25 cents)

THE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION LIBRARY
CHAPEL HILL, NORTH CAROLINA